



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ard Depository  
Brittle Book

LIFE AND DEATH  
AS TAUGHT IN SCRIPTURE



671 24  
= 1

יהוה

INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA

ANDOVER FVNDATA MDCCCVII

ΑΚΡΟΓΩΝΤΙ



ΧΡΥΣΤΟΥ





# LIFE AND DEATH:

*As Taught in Scripture.*

---

LONDON:  
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW.  
1868.

Act. Act. 10

## PREFATORY NOTE.

---

*THIS little volume is presented to the attention of thoughtful Christian men. The subject is one of inexpressible importance, and it is an immense relief to discover that the awful doctrine here controverted has not a shadow of support from the Bible. The idea of endless suffering, on the part of any creature, is such a terrible libel on the character of the blessed GOD, that all who love Him should protest against it.*





# LIFE AND DEATH:

## *As Taught in Scripture.*

---

THE advent of Christ is an event of mighty magnitude; the consummation of the grand plan of salvation is suspended on it; for if Christ never comes, the dead will never be raised, and if the dead are never raised, they can never be judged; and if never judged, they can never be rewarded; and never inherit the kingdom: for Christ is not only designated as the future Judge, but the time when He shall officiate in this capacity is said to be "*at His appearing.*" Nor is this a new item of theology; for Enoch, the seventh from Adam, connected the judgment scene with the coming of Christ, saying, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of His saints, to execute *judgment,*" &c. Not only did Enoch preach the advent of Christ, but he connected that event with the judgment. But to be more precise, we will look at various

features of the Advent faith, and thus learn whether "Adventism" is really in harmony with the Bible or not.

### IS CHRIST LITERALLY TO COME FROM HEAVEN AGAIN ?

**M**ANY think so. Is it a revealed truth, or is it an error? Is the coming of Christ to be a literal or spiritual event? What say the Scriptures? Paul thus speaks to his Thessalonian brethren: "Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven, *whom He raised from the dead*, even Jesus" (1 Thess. i. 9, 10). Who were they waiting for? God's Son. Where from? "From heaven." What Son of God were they waiting for from heaven? The very One "whom He raised from the dead." Then God has a Son in heaven, has He not? Yes. And that Son was once dead, was He not? Yes. And God raised Him from the dead, did He not? Yes. And that is the very Personage we are to wait for from heaven, is it not? Certainly.

This agrees with the Saviour's own testimony to the seer of Patmos, after His ascension: "I am He that liveth, and *was dead*; and, behold, I am alive for evermore" (Rev. i. 18). This is the very Personage

of whom the heavenly messengers declared, "This *same Jesus*, which is *taken up* from you *into heaven*, shall *so come* IN LIKE MANNER as ye have seen Him go into heaven" (Acts i. 11). The "same Jesus" who once died, and was raised, went up to heaven, and is still in heaven; this "same Jesus" is to come from heaven, not spiritually, but "in like manner as" the disciples saw Him ascend. Before taking His departure from earth, Jesus affirmed, "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will *come again*, and receive you unto Myself" (John xiv. 3). Christ literally went away and He will literally return: "Behold, He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him, and they also that pierced Him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him" (Rev. i. 7). This event cannot be counterfeited; "all" will "see" the Saviour come in the "*clouds*" of heaven, and sinners will "*wail*."

It will be no spiritual affair, like coming in the "clouds of *events*," as some explain the matter; for "the *Lord Himself* shall *descend from heaven* WITH A SHOUT, with the voice of the Archangel, and with THE TRUMP OF GOD; and the DEAD IN CHRIST SHALL RISE" (1 Thess. iv. 16). Thus the coming of Christ is connected with the sounding of the trump of God, which arouses the slumbering dead from their tombs; and

moreover, the Apostle adds, "Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them [the raised saints] in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." This cannot be spiritualized. Christ will return literally, and the raised saints, together with the living saints, changed to an immortal state, will rise to "*meet Him*" in the air, and thenceforward "*for ever be with the Lord.*" With this fact in mind, well might Paul affirm, "Unto them that look for Him shall He appear the *SECOND time*, without sin [or a 'sin offering'] unto *salvation*" (Heb. ix. 28).

Not only is this event designated the "*second*" coming of Christ (thus proving it as truly *literal* as the *first*; as the second is a *repetition* of the first, and of the *same order*, else it would simply be the first of one order, and the first of another, instead of being a "*second*" of any one order; and as all admit that the first was the advent of a literal personage, it must be conceded that the second must also be): but, moreover, this second advent is to bring "*salvation*" to the saints. And while this event shall bring salvation to God's people, it will, at the same time, bring destruction to the impenitent; thus it will be like the "pillar" that cast *light* on Israel and *darkness* on the Egyptians; for "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking

*vengeance* on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ : who shall be *punished* with everlasting *destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power ; when He shall come to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believe" (2 Thess. i. 7—10).

Since the "salvation" of saints, and the "destruction" and "punishment" of sinners is connected with Christ's coming, if we spiritualize a *part*, we must the *whole* ; thus we must either deny a literal salvation to the saints, and a literal punishment to the sinner, or admit a literal coming of Christ in the future. He once came in an humble garb, but now He comes in the glory of all heaven—the *same Person* in different clothing—once appearing in "swaddling clothes," but now in a cloud of glory. Once He came to be numbered with the dead, but now to end death's long reign. Once He came to weep, but now to wipe away all tears. Once He came as the "Man of Sorrows," but now to make an end of sorrow among His people. How changed the scene ! Then He was ridiculed, scourged, bound and crucified by wicked men ; but now "shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And He shall send His angels with a great sound of a

trumpet, and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds" (Matt. xxiv. 30, 31). This is one feature of the doctrine, styled "Adventism." It proclaims a "second" personal mission of Jesus Christ to our globe.

### FOR WHAT PURPOSE IS CHRIST COMING ?

WE meet with many who endorse the doctrine of the future personal coming of Christ; yet they can see no *necessity* for this event. They have imbibed a theory which makes Christ's coming a needless event. But when we learn for what purpose Christ is to come, we shall not only recognise this event as a needful item in the Divine plan, but as an absolutely indispensable pre-requisite to our entrance into the kingdom of God. But why so ?

1. Because Christ has been "ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead" (Acts x. 42), and Paul affirms that He "shall judge the quick and the dead *at His APPEARING*" (2 Tim. iv. 1). Hence, it follows, if neither the living nor the dead are to be *judged* till Christ's "*appearing*," none can receive their reward at any earlier date: for judgment is for the express purpose of deciding who are worthy; and judgment includes both the decision and its execution: and it is not possible to have a decision executed

before it is passed. But *provided* the saints enter glory at death, that would be the execution of the decision in their favour, and the *decision* must have *preceded its execution*; then what becomes of the work which Paul says Christ is to do "*at His appearing*?" It is then all done *before* His appearing, and God's plan is set aside. Can that theory be right which would overthrow the plan of Heaven? If Paul's location of the judgment is correct, the theory of rewards prior to Christ's coming is opposed to Heaven's arrangement.

Let us learn whether Paul is in harmony with other inspired witnesses on this point; for if he is, it will be apparent to all that there can be no judgment till Christ comes, and no reward till the judgment arrives: hence, Christ must come before the saints can get their reward.

Daniel gives the same chronological place for the judgment scene. After describing the rise of "four great beasts," which the angel explained as symbols of four great earthly governments to arise on the stream of time; after describing the ten horns on the head of the fourth beast, which the angel interpreted as symbols of ten divisions of the fourth and last universal earthly kingdom; and after describing the rise of "another" horn, subsequent to the ten, having "eyes and mouth like a man," which the angel ex-



plains as a symbol of a blasphemous and persecuting power, to prevail till the judgment, he adds :—"I beheld till the thrones [of these horns] were cast down [or overthrown], and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of His head like the pure wool : His throne was like the fiery flame, and His wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him : thousand thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him : **THE JUDGMENT WAS SET, AND THE BOOKS WERE OPENED**" (Dan. vii. 9, 10). Here the judgment is placed down at the end of the history of Gentile monarchy : and if this arrangement is right, there can be no reward before the end of the last section of earthly history that shall precede the judgment : for judgment comes before reward, else there is no use in having a judgment : and who will be presumptuous enough to charge God with folly in planning a "judgment to come," and appointing "a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom He hath ordained," and "raised Him from the dead?"

John gives the same location of the judgment scene : "And I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away ; and there was no place found for them. And

I saw the *dead*, small and great, stand before God: and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the *dead were judged* out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the *dead* which were in it; and death and *hades* gave up the *dead* which were in them; and *they were judged every man according to their works*" (Rev. xx. 11—13).

When the great white throne and its majestic occupant shall appear, then comes the judgment of the "*dead*," and not till then; nor can the dead be rewarded before being judged.

Jesus, also, specifies the time when men are to be judged: "I came not to judge the world [at His first advent], but to save the world. He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall *judge him in the last day*" (John xii. 47, 48). Here Christ Himself definitely locates the work of judgment "*IN THE LAST DAY.*" Then let this arrangement stand, and let no one presume to affirm that we can get our reward as well without the judgment as with it; thus rendering it a useless affair.

Finally, the Apostle locates the judgment under the sounding of the seventh angel, and also *connects the*

*reward* of the ancient prophets, and the various saints of different ages with this judgment to come: "And the seventh angel sounded: and there were great voices in heaven. saying, the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ; . . . thy wrath is come, and *the time of the dead that THEY SHOULD BE JUDGED*, and that thou shouldest *give reward unto Thy servants THE PROPHETS, and to the saints, and them that fear Thy name, small and great*" (Rev. xi. 15—18).

Here the judgment scene is clearly connected with the sounding of the seventh trumpet, and the truth is proclaimed that even the prophets are to get their "*reward*" *subsequent* to this epoch. This must for ever settle the question that "*reward*" is the *result* of judgment, and is received *after* judgment; and, also, that the judgment is not begun till the sounding of the seventh angel.

From the foregoing evidence we learn (1) that the judgment takes place at Christ's "*appearing*;" (2) at the end of the various sections of earthly history represented by the different beasts and horns in Daniel's vision; (3) at the time the great white throne and its heavenly occupant appear; (4) "in the last day;" and (5) under the sounding of the seventh angel. Now, as Christ is to be the Judge, and is not to officiate till

His "APPEARING," or till the "last day," or till the seventh trumpet sounds, and as the old "prophets" as well as the modern saints must go without their reward till Christ shall appear, certainly His coming is an event of some consequence; nay, of the *greatest* consequence: and this judgment cannot come *till Christ comes*.

2. Another answer to the question—"For what purpose is Christ coming?" is this: He is coming to set up His kingdom on earth. Christ's own testimony is, "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the *throne of His glory*: and before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: He shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the *kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (Matt. xxv. 31—34). Thus when Christ is escorted from heaven to earth, by "all the holy angels," "then shall He sit upon the *throne of His glory*;" and "Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom." When is this invitation to be given to the saints? The Saviour's answer is,

“When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him.” Thus the kingdom referred to is one that the saints do not inherit till Christ shall return from heaven in His kingly grandeur.

But what kingdom is alluded to? Not a kingdom that preceded the formation of our globe, but simply, “The kingdom prepared [for the faithful] *from the foundation of the world* ;” once placed under the supervision of the first Adam, who fell, and brought a curse on the fair inheritance, under which it has been groaning for many centuries ; but God has promised a “restitution” under a great heir of David, a personage who should be not only of human, but also of Divine origin, constituting Him both the “*root* and the *offspring* of David,” of whom it is said “David calleth Him *Lord*.” This remarkable Personage, who was both the *Heir* and *Lord* of David, appeared among the children of men over eighteen hundred years ago, not to begin His reign, but to suffer as the “Lamb of God.”

But the contemplation of His *reign* so engaged the attention of His followers that His *death* was firstly *overlooked* ; and in their haste they looked for His kingdom without His death. The early disciples were so absorbed with this thought, that they entirely overlooked the *death* of the Messiah, and fixed their atten-

tion wholly upon His *reign*. Their hearts were animated with the hope of a kingdom to come, under the supervision of the Messiah. And this hope was *right*, though they looked for its realisation too soon, and also overlooked the death of the Messiah, which was to precede His reign. This hope of a coming kingdom was so thoroughly implanted in their minds, and so confirmed by remarkable miracles, that "Jesus perceived that they would come and take Him by force to make Him a *king*" (John vi. 15); but He eluded their grasp, knowing that the time had not come for Him to take the reins of government.

But the query arises, *Why* were they looking for Jesus to become a king? Was this expectation a groundless conjecture, or was it derived from the Word of God? We answer, *provided* the disciples were right in recognising Jesus as the true Messiah, they were also right in looking for Him to become a king at some stage of His history: for the same prophets who had so clearly predicted the coming of the Messiah, had with equal clearness foretold His *reign*. The prophet Isaiah had spoken on this wise: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the GOVERNMENT shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called . . . The Mighty God" (chap. ix. 6). The disciples knew if Jesus was really this

"Son," who should be called "The Mighty God"—"God with us"—that He would certainly stand at the head of the government sooner or later, for inspiration had clearly stated, "THE GOVERNMENT SHALL BE UPON HIS SHOULDER . . . . of the increase of His government and peace there shall be *no end, upon the throne of David*, and upon His kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice *from henceforth even for ever.*"

They were not mistaken in supposing that this predicted heir of David was destined to be a king : and when they called to mind the remarkable scenes interwoven with the history of Jesus, they could not doubt that He was this heir of David ; for (1) before His birth the angel Gabriel had positively affirmed, "The Lord God shall give unto HIM the throne of His father David;" (2) at His birth an angel also affirmed, "Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ," or Messiah, and "suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God ;" (3) at His baptism "the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descended upon Him ;" (4) at His transfiguration "a bright cloud overshadowed them; and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased : " and (5) they had witnessed His

remarkable miracles in restoring sight to the blind, in healing the sick, in casting out devils, and in raising the dead; with these facts fresh in memory, how could they doubt that He was this heir of David, who should be called "the Mighty God?" And if He was really that Personage, they knew that the "government" "should be upon His shoulder," and He should occupy David's throne.

But they, overlooking the fact that the Messiah must suffer and die prior to the commencement of His reign, were looking for His reign to begin at too early a point of time; and in consequence of this premature expectation they were involved in a bitter disappointment. They were looking for the kingdom before the cross. "They thought that the kingdom of God should *immediately* appear" (Luke xix. 11); and animated with this delightful expectation, the anxious mother of two disciples came to Jesus, saying, "Grant that these my two sons may sit the one on Thy right hand, and the other on Thy left hand in Thy kingdom:" and upon one occasion, as Jesus was riding into Jerusalem, "they spread their clothes in the way," and "the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice . . . saying, Blessed be the KING that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Luke xix. 36—38). Their minds were fixed upon



the right personage as the long-foretold king, but they were looking for His elevation to the throne at too early a date.

Presently their hope was put to the test, and entirely blighted for a time. A band of wicked men laid hands on their prospective king—Jesus becomes a prisoner—and in mockery of His claim to the kingship, they invest Him with a "*crown of thorns*," and insultingly salute Him, "Hail, King of the Jews." In His trial He is charged with seeking to make Himself a king. Thus His enemies and His friends were agreed in the supposition that Jesus contemplated the immediate establishment of His kingdom. Although it was in His power to call legions of angels to aid Him in escaping from His foes, Jesus submits, and dies on the cross—THE "EXPECTED KING OF ISRAEL" DIES—and the disciples are robbed of their sweet hope : their happy dreams of a coming kingdom under the sceptre of Jesus had faded away, and gloom enveloped and enshrouded them like a thick mantle. Their hope was blighted by this unexpected blow, as they had overlooked all the allusions Jesus had made to His death and resurrection, having<sup>†</sup> had their minds so fully absorbed with the contemplation of His *reign* that they could see nothing else ; and after Jesus had slept in the sepulchre three days, "AS YET THEY KNEW

NOT THE SCRIPTURE THAT HE MUST RISE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD" (John xx. 9). Destitute of the understanding that He was to rise again, the blow that laid Jesus in the grave obliterated their hope, and bitter disappointment was the portion of the cup that they drank to its dregs.

Certain women, not knowing that Jesus was destined to rise again, came to anoint him three days after His crucifixion; but to their astonishment, instead of finding Jesus in the sepulchre, they are told by a "vision of angels" that Jesus "IS RISEN." Oh! rapturous thought! Jesus was really *alive again!* The same day He appeared to two disciples on their way to Emmaus, and after listening to their rehearsal of a blighted hope, "We had trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel," He replied, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe ALL that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?" (Luke xxiv. 25, 26.)

Now there is a *change* in the feelings of the disciples; their hope revives; their expected king is no longer dead, but really alive, and now all is plain: there is still a chance for Him to become King; and moreover, they can now locate the prophecies relating to His death and resurrection, which they had

previously overlooked, and can clearly see that if the Messiah was *ever* to die in fulfilment of prophecy, it would be *reasonable* as well as scriptural to have His death *precede* His reign: because (1) it would not look well to have His death occur after the establishment of His kingdom, and thus throw the entire kingdom into mourning; and (2) it would clash with prophecy which represents His reign as being endless. By having His death precede His reign, they were furnished with a fresh proof of His Messiahship, because prophecy affirmed that the true Messiah should be "*cut off*," and enter the "*grave*;" and now in confirmation of His claim to the Messiahship here, and the Kingship hereafter, they could not only refer to Gabriel's statement before His birth, to the announcement of an angel at His birth, to the scene at His baptism, to the announcement made at His transfiguration, and to His miracles, as Divine sanctions of His claim, but they could now add a new proof to the list—His death and resurrection.

They were now begotten anew to the hope of a kingdom under the Messiah, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Their expected King was again alive, and being the true claimant to the throne of David, they still confidently looked for Him to begin His reign at an early date; hence, forty days

after the resurrection, they inquire: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" They were still looking for the kingdom too early. Jesus said to them, "It is not [now] for you to know the times and seasons which the Father hath put in His own power; but ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you" (Acts 1. 6—8. Jesus did not then see fit to tell them how long it would be before the introduction of the kingdom, but assured them that after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit they should receive power to know more about it; and while making this statement, He was taken from their midst, and "received up into heaven." But two angels stood by to make the affirmation, "This same Jesus" shall return: so their expectation of the establishment of His kingdom was not cut off by His departure; their hope was not again blighted. Jesus will come back—this thought gladdened their hearts—Jesus will return and set up His kingdom. Perhaps for a time they fancied that He would be gone but a few weeks or months, preparatory to establishing His kingdom. But after the Holy Spirit fell upon them, on the day of Pentecost, they clearly saw that Christ must officiate as the antitypical High Priest till the time should come for Him to "judge the quick and the dead at His **APPEARING.**" Subsequently, in the

"revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him, to show unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass," the different sections of earth's history to precede the introduction of Messiah's kingdom were clearly marked off, thus enabling the Church to determine when the kingdom will come. For instance, in the chain of seven trumpets, the establishment of the kingdom is located under the seventh trumpet: "And the seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. xi. 15). Under the sounding of the *same* trumpet comes "THE TIME OF THE DEAD THAT THEY SHOULD BE JUDGED" (v. 18), and Christ "shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and kingdom;" so the *reign* of Christ begins not till the resurrection.

When Christ appears it will be (1) to raise the dead; (2) to judge the dead; and (3) to reward the dead. The kingdom of the Messiah will include not only those saints who are found alive at its introduction, but likewise all the saints that are now dead, who will then be made to live again, and have their once "vile bodies changed, and fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body."

There is one point of difference between the faith of the disciples in the early part of their history, and the present faith of the Church. The disciples were "slow of heart to believe what the prophets had spoken" about the *death* of Christ, and could see nothing but the *reign* of Christ; but now the Church has rushed to the opposite extreme, and are "slow of heart to believe what the prophets have spoken" about Messiah's *reign*, and can see nothing but His *death*. Christ demands that we should believe ALL that the prophets have spoken—not only what relates to His death, but likewise what pertains to His reign.

The theory which ignores the future kingdom of Messiah on earth, or seeks to substitute a sky-kingdom in its stead, is subversive of the Divine plan. Christ must yet reign on "David's throne," even "in Mount Zion;" and "of His kingdom there shall be no end." The saints of every age will be there, all "equal to the angels." Glorious era! Soon may it dawn in fadeless beauty and matchless splendour! Hail thou once *thorned-crowned* Messiah! Come and wear the kingly crown of glory. Soon claim Thy throne, and gather Thy jewels. "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

## WHEN WILL THE MESSIAH COME TO REIGN ?

IT is neither reasonable nor Scriptural to suppose that the reign of Messiah could begin prior to the judgment; and having now learned that the judgment cannot come till the future "appearing" of Christ, His reign cannot be looked for before that appearing. It would not be reasonable to expect His reign before the arrival of the judgment, as it could not previously be determined who were entitled to a seat in His kingdom: and it would not be scriptural to look for the kingdom before the judgment arrives; as Christ "shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His *kingdom* (2 Tim. iv. 1). Here the Apostle suspends both the judgment and the "*kingdom*" on the appearing of Christ; hence, not until Christ appears will the judgment come, and not until the judgment arrives will the kingdom come. This, then, is Heaven's order: (1) the appearing of Christ; (2) the judgment scene; (3) the kingdom.

Many modern theologians insist that Christ cannot come till all the inhabitants of earth have been Christianized, and shall have enjoyed a millennium of blessedness; and that this state of felicity and Christian triumph over all the powers of darkness

will constitute the kingdom of Christ. But this theory clashes with two invulnerable truths. It presents the kingdom before the judgment comes, and before the slumbering saints of previous ages are called from their dark beds of death to enjoy it; which would be contrary to the inspired programme. Furthermore, the theory of evangelising the world as a whole, prior to the coming of Christ, is opposed to the teaching of Inspiration, which clearly presents the fact that evil will not only continue to exist even down to the end of the history of humanity in mortality, but that it will really *predominate* just prior to the coming of Christ: hence, the theory which flatters men that Christ cannot come till all the world is Christianized, is but a snare of the enemy to keep them from seeing the great truth of our nearness to this grand event.

Jesus represents the sowing of good seed, or "wheat" in a certain "field," and also the sowing of "tares" in the same field by an "enemy;" and both kinds of seed sprang up, and were allowed to grow and ripen "together." And Jesus' own explanation of the matter (after saying, "Let them grow together until the *harvest*") is as follows: "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one:



the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the *harvest* IS THE END OF THE AGE; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this age" (Matt. xiii. 30, 38, 40). Here we are distinctly taught that the righteous and wicked will remain together in this world [*kosmos*, or material globe] till "the end of the world [*aion*, or age]," when the tares, or the wicked, shall be "burned in the fire."

What can be plainer? Does this look like having all the world converted? or like having all the tares changed into wheat before the end comes? Far from it. It is an irresistible *veto* on that theory. Moreover, when Christ comes, the world will be as in "the days of Noah" (Matt. xxiv. 37); "also as it was in the days of Lot: they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded: but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and *destroyed them all*: EVEN THUS SHALL IT BE IN THE DAY WHEN THE SON OF MAN IS REVEALED." This looks quite unlike a converted world. Then two shall be in the bed, two in the mill, and two in the field—"one shall be taken, and the other left;" or, in other words, one shall be saved, and the other be lost.

The "spirits of devils, working miracles," are to figure conspicuously upon the human stage just before Christ shall "come as a thief" (Rev. xvi. 14, 15). The symbolic "beast" that was to slaughter God's saints for forty-two months is to continue in existence, with the "false prophet," till the coming of the "King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Rev. xix. 11—21). Also the little horn on Daniel's fourth beast must continue "till the Ancient of Days should come, and judgment be given to the saints of the Most High" (Dan. vii. 21). If these corrupt powers continue till the coming of Christ, there is no place for a millennium of bliss prior to His coming. We are not to look for such events to precede the Saviour's return to reign.

All who have carefully perused the Scriptures concede the fact that there are numerous declarations pertaining to a coming kingdom, or predictions concerning the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth. There is no dispute among theologians concerning this fact. But with regard to its *nature*, and the time of its establishment, there are diversities of opinion—some maintaining that it is a spiritual kingdom, instead of being literal, and that it was set up 1,800 years ago. The *only* ground for this theory is the fact that the component elements of this king-

dom—such as the king, territory, and subjects—are sometimes denominated the kingdom, on the principle of putting a *part* for the *whole*, as in the following instances: “For the kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country” (Matt. xxv. 14). Here Christ, one component element of the kingdom, is spoken of as the “kingdom.” Again: “They shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend” (Matt. xiii. 41). Here another element—the territory—is spoken of as the kingdom. Also, we read: “Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened to ten virgins” (Matt. xxv. 1). Still another element—the Church, or prospective subjects—are spoken of as the kingdom, on the same principle of putting a part for the whole. But these component elements are in an unorganised state at present, and must be organised in order to be a kingdom complete. Without the organisation of these elements, there can be no setting up of the kingdom. The prospective King is now in a far country, and must return. The territory is now in a dilapidated state, and must be cleansed. The prospective subjects, in part, are dead, and must be raised; and a part are living in a *mortal* state, and must be changed to immortality. All this is requisite to the organisation of these component elements of the kingdom, which work involves

the advent of Christ, and the resurrection of the dead: hence, the setting up of the kingdom cannot precede the coming of Christ—no matter how often these unfinished *parts* may be called by the name of the *whole*. All of the parts, in their perfected state, are requisite to the formation of the glorious whole. But we inquire :

I. *What is the nature of His kingdom ?*

Our negative answer is, *It is not spiritual.*

i. We may be met with the declaration that the kingdom of God is "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." This is *characteristic* of that kingdom, and, consequently, we must be recipients of this element in order to dwell there, as counter-elements can never enter it: but to insist that this element alone *constitutes the kingdom*, would be to exclude both the King and the subjects, and make man the territory: and instead of allowing it to be true that man is to "*enter into the kingdom*," it would so change the arrangement as to have the kingdom enter into man: besides, if this element constitutes a *kingdom*, its inauguration could not have been *future* when the prophet Daniel said—"In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom" (Dan. ii. 44), for this element dwelt in the hearts of saints before Daniel's time, because "holy men of

old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." When we read, "God is love," no one thinks of coming to the conclusion that *love is God*. Why, then, should men conclude, when they read that the kingdom of God is "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit," that therefore "righteousness, peace, and joy" is the kingdom of God? The first text gives the prominent characteristic of the Deity, and the second gives the characteristic of the celestial kingdom. If the first text does not prove that *love is God*, neither does the second prove that "righteousness, peace, and joy" is a kingdom. One conclusion is as logical as the other.

2. We may be reminded that Christ said, "The kingdom of God is within you." So He did to the *Pharisees*, but *not* to His disciples; therefore He could not have meant within the heart, but as in the margin, "within your midst," or "among you," which was true of one element of the kingdom—the prospective King—a *part* being put for the *whole*, as in other instances. But the subjects still remained in their mortal state, and the territory, also, continued under the curse, and even *He* soon took His departure "into a far country to *receive* for Himself a kingdom" (Luke xix, 12), all of which proves the organisation of the kingdom then future.

3. We may be told that Jesus affirmed, "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." So He did: and while this could never be true of a spiritual kingdom in the heart, it was true of Christ, one element of the future kingdom. Christ suffered violence in this world, and was taken by force. So it has often been with His saints. The theological idea of *holy violence* is simply ridiculous.

To the question, What is the nature of this kingdom? we reply affirmatively, *It is literal.*

1. Its component elements are all literal. Jesus, the prospective King, is a literal Being. The raised saints, who are destined to be the subjects, are literal beings. The territorial "kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world," is, also, literal. With a literal King, literal subjects, and a literal territory, we must have a literal kingdom. Yet it will be unlike literal earthly kingdoms in one essential particular—it will be established on the basis of immortality: the King and subjects will live eternally, devoid of pain or sickness, "and the kingdom shall not be left to other people," and it shall have "no end."

2. It is presented as the *fifth* of a series of universal kingdoms on earth, in the second and seventh

chapters of Daniel—four of which kingdoms have been literal, leaving the principle upon which the greater part of the prophecy has already been fulfilled as a guarantee of the literal fulfilment of the balance. When God foretells the rise of five universal kingdoms, and we see four of them rise as *literal* kingdoms, can we query whether the fifth will be literal?

II. *Its chronological place.*

Its establishment cannot be in the past.

1. Because it was not to exist cotemporary with the kingdoms of earth, but to succeed them: the “stone,” representing the kingdom of God, was not to “fill the whole earth” *till* the image was “*broken to pieces*,” and “carried away” as by an irresistible tornado, “that *no place* was found for them.” This is not in the past.

2. It is still a matter of “*promise*” and not of actual possession; and the saints are yet only “*heirs*” to it, and not possessors: “Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and *heirs* of the kingdom which He hath *promised* to them that love Him?” As long as the saints are “*heirs*” to it, it cannot be in their possession—cannot be in the past.

It is still future.

1. Because after Christ had enumerated a long chain of events to precede His second coming, He adds: "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is *nigh at hand*." (Luke xxi. 31). These events span the Gospel age, reaching nearly to the revelation of the Saviour: hence, the establishment of the kingdom is subsequent to this age—agreeing with Christ's statement at His trial, "My kingdom is *not from hence*"—not from that time.

2. The seer of Patmos places it after the sounding of the seventh angel: "And the seventh angel sounded; . . . the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. xi. 15). The resurrection of the dead being connected with the sounding of this trumpet, shows it a future scene, and, consequently, proves the ushering in of the *kingdom* still future.

3. Daniel locates it not only after the ten divisions of the "fourth kingdom," but, also, subsequent to the history of the horn, which was to rise after these divisions, and continue to exist till the coming of the Ancient of Days (Dan. vii. 21). These conspicuous facts cannot be obliterated.

### III. *Its geographical place.*

Is it to be in heaven or on earth? Not in heaven,



for there has been order there for ages past, and it does not need to be superseded by a better arrangement; indeed, such a claim would virtually cast reflections on the former government of Jehovah. But this long-foretold kingdom is to be inaugurated in a realm where disorder and evil have long predominated, and where such a change would be a blessing, namely, in the *earth*. The proof is abundant.

1. Daniel informs us that it shall be "*under* the whole heaven" (Dan. vii. 27). This is explicit.

2. The Apostle informs us that it will be composed of the "kingdoms of this world," minus their unholy inhabitants, whom God will "destroy."

3. Christ informs us that it is to include the territorial "kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world" (Matt. xxv. 34).

4. At the "end of this world" Christ "shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather *out of His kingdom* all things that offend" (Matt. xiii. 41). The wicked are to be disinherited preparatory to giving it to the raised saints. Then the "meek shall inherit," and for ever "reign on the earth."

## ARE THE DEAD TO BE RAISED LITERALLY?

THAT the dead saints are to literally live again is a truth clearly set forth in the Scriptures, despite modern efforts to spiritualise the doctrine of the resurrection. Isaiah could affirm with confidence, "Thy *dead* men shall LIVE, together with my *dead body* shall they ARISE; AWAKE and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall *cast out the DEAD*" (Isa. xxvi. 19). Here is a resurrection promised which takes hold of "*dead men*," even the "*dead BODY*," and not of an undying entity that is to be raised from the body at its death, as one class of theologians now teach. This resurrection takes hold of the very matter that has been deposited in the earth; "for the earth shall cast out the dead." In this resurrection the dead saints are to "*awake*," and "*arise*," and "*live*." As the dews of spring put new life into the dead herbage, so the dew of Jehovah's power, after the winter of death has ended, and the resurrection spring-time has come, shall come in contact with the lifeless forms of God's children, and infuse new life into them, and the "*dead body*" of every saint will both "*arise*" and "*live*."

In sweet contemplation of this grand event, "our

conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall *change* our vile *body*, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body" (Phil. iii. 20, 21). Thus we discover that, when "the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the *dead* in Christ shall rise first," not only will the dead saints be made alive, but, by virtue of a special change, the once "vile *body*" will be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body, of whom it is affirmed, "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him" (Rom. vi. 9). So when the saints are raised and "changed," death will have no more dominion over them; and well might Jesus affirm, "They that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, . . . . *neither can they die any more*, for they are equal to the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection" (Luke xx. 36).

Those who share in this resurrection once could die, as the saying, "Neither can they die *any more*," clearly proves; but this could not be said of a deathless entity, that had escaped from the body at death. In view of a literal resurrection, Paul could say, "If the Spirit of Him that *raised up Jesus from the dead*

dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall *also quicken* [make alive] YOUR MORTAL BODIES by His Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. viii. 11); and immediately after this statement he adds, "Our-selves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for the adoption*, to wit, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY" (ver. 23). Here reference is made to "*mortal bodies*;" and after asserting that Jesus was raised up "from the dead" by the Spirit, we are told that the same Spirit shall "*also make alive our mortal bodies.*" As "that which thou sowest *is not quickened except it die,*" the quickening here referred to relates to something that had *died*, as well as to "*mortal bodies*;" that is, reference is made to "*mortal bodies*" that had *died*; as that which is not dead cannot be quickened, or made alive; and that which is already alive cannot be *made alive*; so this making alive of *dead* "*mortal bodies*" cannot be spiritualised away.

In connection with this thought comes "the redemption of our body;" and certainly *death* does not redeem the body, but drags it into a firmer bondage, and will hold it till a literal resurrection shall liberate it; and without a literal resurrection "the redemption of the body" cannot be realised, except in the act of translation at the coming of Christ.

The advocates of a spiritual resurrection inform us that the material man passes through a total change once in seven years, and assert that the man who is *seventy years old* has had *ten* different bodies, and then ask, Which one of the ten is to be *raised*? If this seven-year-change theory is *unqualifiedly* correct, the human body is never over seven years of age; consequently the man who is seventy years old should have been a grey-headed man *ten times*, as the tenth body is not a day older than the first one in the series. Then why is not the first body as infirm as the tenth? Why should not the first body as really wear grey hairs as the tenth? Why is not the human face covered with wrinkles at the age of seven, seeing the body is never any older? Certainly, if this theory is correct, the the first body, being as old as the tenth, should be *mature*, grey-headed, wrinkled-face, and infirm; for it certainly cannot be claimed that the soul produces these results; causing one body, at the age of seven years, to bloom with health and vigour, and another body of the same age to be infirm and grey! If this theory is a reliable argument against a literal resurrection, why is it that the person who is once afflicted with the small-pox or measles can never take the same disease again? Why may not a man have the small-pox every seven years, if he has a body entirely new

so often? It cannot be said that the small-pox is a malady that afflicts an immortal soul within the material man, as well as the man of dust, and that the continued residence of this same soul in several successive bodies is the reason why only one of these seven-year bodies can be afflicted with this disease. Hence, if this theory is really a valid argument against a literal resurrection, no good reason can be given why the small-pox may not be *ten times* experienced in the history of the man who lives to be seventy years old. And yet all know this is not a possible thing.

This theory, carried out, would endlessly perpetuate human life, except when disease or accident might cut it short; for, if the first seven-year body could wind up its history in health and vigour, unless prevented by some disease or accident, so might the *tenth*, the *twentieth*, the *fiftieth*, the *hundredth*, and so on endlessly. But facts deny the *possibility* of this, even if all accidents and diseases could be warded off.

If this is a valid argument against a literal resurrection, it can be used with equal force in favour of several absurdities. For instance, a man and woman are married, and thus the woman "is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth" (Rom. vii. 2); but, at the end of seven years, the wife can claim that she is not the woman that entered into the

marriage contract with that man; there not being a particle of matter in her system which helped to make her body seven years before, when the marriage took place. Thus, if this theory is good for anything against a literal resurrection, it liberates people from their marriage covenants once in seven years, and charges every one with adultery who will not then marry anew, or dissolve their family relation. Should the objector say, "They have the same *souls* that they had at their marriage." I ask, Are deathless souls married to each other "*so long as they live?*" If so, it would not only carry the marriage covenant into the "spirit world," but it would also involve the ridiculous idea that the man who had married several wives here would have several spirit-wives there; and the man who had married a *widow* here, would have to contest his claim there with her former husband! Besides, what if the spirit-wife should be saved, and the spirit-husband should be damned? Would the marriage contract stand?

Who believes that people are released from the marriage covenant every seven years? It is so if this argument disproves a literal resurrection, unless it should be claimed that the soul is married to the soul; and then, who is willing to accept the inevitable but revolting conclusion that the marriage covenant extends

into the much-talked-of "spirit world," with its plurality of spirit-wives, and the scene of strife in deciding which spirit-man shall claim the spirit-widow who had been married several times? This is the legitimate result of this theory which is used to disprove the possibility of a literal resurrection.

Again: The murderer, who, for seven years, has eluded the grasp of the pursuing officer, is finally captured, tried, and taken to the gallows to be hung till he is "*dead*." But, adopting this theology, he insists that he is not the man who committed the murder, claiming that there is not a particle of the matter in his system that helped to make up the body of the murderer. Now, if this theory really obliterates the doctrine of a literal resurrection, that man is entitled to his release. But will it be said that he has the same *soul* that dwelt in the murderer? Well, can you inflict the penalty upon a soul which you say is immortal—hang *it* till *it* is "*dead, dead, DEAD?*" If you could do this impossibility, would you be justified in killing an innocent body with it? If you could not, would it be right to murder an innocent body, when by so doing you could not expect to kill the guilty soul? Will men use an argument to disprove a real resurrection which will just as clearly sanction such monstrous absurdities?



Yet this theory has just enough truth about it to deceive many. It has been scientifically determined that in the human system there are a variety of "*life-cells*," which are the receivers of nourishment in one of its stages and are capable of contraction or expansion; and thus the human system is replenished; and, as there is a gradual passing off of substances received into the life-cells, the system is at times diminished: thus a man is at one time heavier, and at another time lighter; and this passing off of matter thus received into the system has been unjustly construed into the claim that the *entire man* undergoes a change.

In addition to the claim that a literal resurrection is impossible, we are told there is no *need* of raising the material man *if* the spirit-man continues to live after the body-man dies. That "*if*" is well employed; for, although we believe man has a spirit, we are not warranted in believing that it is a *personality*, either in the body or out of it, as we shall show elsewhere. But we inquire if the so-called spirit-man has no necessary connection with the body-man, and can live, think, and act without it, why did God make a body-man to put the spirit-man into? If the spirit-man does not need the body-man after death, did it need it before death? If the body-man is only a prison-house

for the spirit-man to live in, why was it first imprisoned there? If the body-man has always been a detriment, a clog, a shackle to the spirit-man, was it not a mistake to make a body-man, seeing the spirit-man would have been so much better off without it? If the body-man for ever passes into oblivion at death, and has only been a hindrance to the spirit-man during its existence, why was it ever made?

In the light of this theory, seeing no need of a resurrection of the material *body*, the conclusion has been that only the soul is to participate in the resurrection glory; that there is no resurrection OF the dead, but merely a resurrection FROM the dead; a mere resurrection, or rising up of the *internal living man* from the *external dead man*, at the hour of death, forgetting that inspiration has affirmed that "the earth shall cast out the *dead*," and that "*dead men shall live*" (Isa. xxvi. 19).

Those who deny a resurrection of the body render themselves obnoxious to the charge which the Saviour thundered in the ears of the Sadducees, who also denied a resurrection: "Ye do greatly *err*, not knowing the Scriptures nor the *power of God*." God's *power* to raise the dead should not be limited or questioned. When He speaks let us believe, even if it clashes with "*vain philosophy*." Said Job—"Though

after my skin worms destroy this body, yet *in my flesh* shall I see God" (chap. xix. 26), He here makes a thrust at modern scepticism, which claims that the body cannot be reanimated after having become food for worms. Job forestalls the sceptic, and admits that worms might eat up his body, and then affirms that, notwithstanding this, he should, *in his flesh*, see God, "at the latter day," when his Redeemer should come.

The nature of the future resurrection is clearly foreshadowed by the resurrection of Christ, who was raised as the "first fruits" of the great resurrection harvest of holy ones, or, in other words, as the *sample* or *specimen* (1 Cor. xv. 20, 23). The harvest must be like the "first-fruits," or *specimen*. Therefore, if Christ's resurrection consisted merely in the *rising* of the *soul* from the body at the hour of death, then may our resurrection be of the same character. After Christ's resurrection He affirms, "I am He that liveth *and was dead*" (Rev. i. 18). That part of Christ which shared in the resurrection had once been "*dead*." Thus that part of the saint which is "*dead*" must rise, as the harvest must resemble the "first fruits." "*It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual BODY*" —not a spirit. "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body : and *so it is written*, The first man, Adam, was made a living soul [a natural body] : the

last Adam was made [by the resurrection] a quickening *spirit* [or spiritual body]. Howbeit that was not *first* which was *spiritual*, but that which is *natural*; and *afterward* that which is *spiritual*. The first man is of the earth, earthy [the natural body]; the second man is the Lord from heaven [the spiritual body] . . . . And as we have borne the image of the earthy [body], we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (1 Cor. xv. 44—49). Thus the Apostle argues that our mortal body is the "natural body," and the resurrection body is to be the spiritual body; and the raised body of Christ is pointed to as a sample of the "spiritual body," with the assurance that the natural body is "*first*," and the spiritual body "*afterward*;" hence the statement "we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," or have our bodies "fashioned like Christ's glorious body." Paul never represents the "natural body" and the "spiritual body" as existing *cotemporaneously*; but the "natural" is "*first*," and the "spiritual" is "*afterward*;" Christ, "the first fruits," being mentioned as having already received the spiritual body.

We are reminded that Paul in speaking of the resurrection illustrates it by the practice of sowing grain, and then we are told that there is a "*germ*" in the grain that does not die. It is true that Paul

uses the custom of sowing grain to illustrate our present naked or *unclothed* condition, in contrast with our clothed condition at the resurrection, when we shall be "*clothed upon*, that mortality might be swallowed up of life;" and this he does by using the "*bare*," or unclothed grain, to represent us in our mortal state; its own species in the harvest, ripe and clothed, to represent our clothed state at the resurrection harvest. But Paul says not a word about a "*germ*;" and we should not make more of his illustration than *he* used it for. However, if theologians will crowd upon us the question of the *germ*, which Paul never hinted at, we inquire, Does the farmer *separate* the *germ* from the grain when he sows it? or does he sow the *germ* with the grain? Does he carry the germ up chamber, and leave the grain to rot in the ground? or is the *germ* thus separated for a time, and afterward connected with the grain to make it sprout? Then why insist that a spirit-germ, as a *personality*, is disconnected from the body? Let *germ* and body go together, or be silent about the "*germ*." But Paul settles the whole question by telling us, "This *mortal* must put on immortality" (v. 53). This blots out the theory of a spiritual resurrection for the saints—the "*mortal*" part must rise.

## WHY ARE THE DEAD TO BE RAISED?

THE doctrine of a future literal resurrection is believed by many who see no need of having the dead live again. They have imbibed the idea that death is a great liberator and glorious benefactor to the saints of God, instead of being an "*enemy*," as Paul affirms; and that death will open the door of glory for them, and usher them into the rapturous Paradise of God, the home of the angels. And if death really accomplishes all this for the saints, what could a resurrection add to their felicity? If all this can be gained without a resurrection, well may the question be asked, What need of a resurrection? But when we learn that the resurrection is a *prerequisite to judgment*, and must therefore *precede* the judgment, and that there is no such thing as entering the kingdom of God previous to the judgment, we can see the *need* of the resurrection.

When we discover that there must be a resurrection before there can be a judgment, and that there must be a judgment before men can enter the celestial kingdom, the resurrection at once appears needful. And this very truth is taught in the Scriptures :

"And *death* and *hades* DELIVERED UP *the dead* that were in them: and THEY WERE JUDGED every man according to their works" (Rev. xx. 13).

Christ comes with "the keys of *hades* and death," and the "*dead*" are then "*delivered up*" to be "*judged*." Thus the "*dead*" remain unjudged till they are "delivered up;" and there is no way for death to deliver up the dead except by having them live again; for death holds them just as long as they remain dead: but the dead ones must come out of death's dark prison before being "*judged*," and they must be judged before being rewarded; for reward is the result of judgment.

When we consider the fact that death merely shuts the saints up in its dark prison, instead of transporting them to glory, the necessity of a resurrection is made still more apparent. Look at the saints of Bible-times, as they have approached the dying hour, and learn whether they regarded death as the door to glory, or to the land of the enemy. When God sent the prophet Isaiah to read a death-warrant to Hezekiah, who had "*a perfect heart*," saying to him, "Thou shalt *die* and not live" (Isa. xxxviii. 1), how did it affect him? Did it fill him with enthusiastic joy? It certainly would have produced this effect, seeing he had a "*perfect heart*," if he had looked

upon death as the door to a realm of felicity. But was this a cheering message to him? No: "Hezekiah *wept sore.*" Would a saint, having a "perfect heart," thus weep if told that the time had come for him to enter the kingdom of glory? Would the opening of a door into glory cause a saint to weep? But this is not all: Hezekiah fervently prays to have death deferred. But was that prayer a petition for the privilege of staying out of glory a little while longer? Who will take this position? And yet it amounts to that if death is the door to Paradise. But in answer to his prayer, God "added to his days fifteen years." Was this merely a permit for him to stay out of glory fifteen years longer? Was it not rather a permit for him to stay out of death's dark prison a little longer? So Hezekiah understood it; for immediately after his recovery, he remarks: "Thou hast in love to my soul *delivered* it from the pit of corruption" (v. 17).

If death were really the door into the world of bliss, would it not have been cruel for Jesus to have wrought that miracle on Lazarus, thus calling him out of glory after he had "four days" enjoyed the society of angels, with harp and palm and crown in his possession? Did Christ work a miracle to call a saint out of glory? Who will affirm it? Was it



not rather to call him out of the prison of death? (John xi. 44).

Epaphroditus "was sick nigh unto *death* : but God had *mercy* on him" (Phil. ii. 27) in healing him. Provided death were the door to glory, and a saint were already "*nigh*" that door, would it not be a strange kind of "*mercy*" to close the door against him, and keep him out? Is it really an act of "*mercy*" to prevent saints from entering glory? Who will say it is? Is it not rather an act of mercy to keep the saint from being shut up in death's dark prison?

Was Paul fearful of entering glory, when his life was at stake, and he was "let down in a basket" (Acts ix. 25), thus making his escape, either from the door to death's gloomy prison, or from the door to glory—which?

Anciently to preach that "the resurrection is past already" had a tendency to "*overthrow the faith of some,*" which could not be the case if death were the door to glory.

## WHERE ARE THE RAISED SAINTS TO DWELL?

HAVING learned that the "dead in Christ shall rise" when "the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God," we wish to find out *where* these raised saints are to live. When called from their graves as literal beings, really alive, never more to die, they must have some home in which to live. In what region will they dwell? Christ, in carrying us down to the time when the resurrection will take place, says: "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, . . . then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (Matt. xxv. 31—34). God's original plan was correct, and will yet be carried out. When He created the world, "He formed it to be inhabited" by *man*, in a state of holiness; and He created man to dwell in it as his home, even for ever, *provided* he would be obedient; and man was put on probation for endless life, "the tree of life" being placed before him, that at the end of his term of trial

he might "eat and *live for ever*" in the very world that God had made on purpose for him to dwell in. And while on probation, man was commanded to "be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. i. 28). Thus it is evident that it was God's original plan to have the earth populated with a race of holy and deathless human beings to all eternity. But before man had reached the close of his term of probation, sin was introduced: so God shut man away from the tree of life, "lest he should put forth his hand, and eat and live for ever" in a sinful state.

Thus man was cut off from endless life, while in his fallen condition. Now God gives man *another* probation; and *this time* He places him on trial for *holiness*, as well as for eternal life. Before, man already possessed the Divine favour, and was merely on trial for endless life; but now, having lost the favour of God, as well as the offer of endless life, he is placed on probation with the conditional offer of the Divine favour, and the conditional offer of eternal life—the Divine favour to be secured through faith in Christ; and eternal life to be secured by union to Him, and to be obtained "in the world to come."

After man had sinned, his home, in which he might have lived for ever, free from sorrow, falls under the curse: "*Cursed* is the *ground* for thy sake; in *sorrow*

shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life" (Gen. iii. 18). The curse still rests on the earth; but the time is coming when this sin-cursed and dilapidated earth shall be restored. God once washed it with a flood of water, blotting out a rebellious race, and commencing the world anew: but wickedness soon overspread the earth again; and now God purposes to deluge the earth with "fire," which will both sweep off the wicked, and purge the polluted globe. "The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto FIRE *against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men, . . . in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, . . . wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Nevertheless, we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness*" (2 Pet. iii. 7, 10, 12, 13).

This same great "change" of the present heavens and earth into new heavens and a new earth, after having perished in the coming deluge of fire, is mentioned by the Psalmist: "Of old hast Thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish [in the coming deluge of fire], but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou

CHANGE them, and they shall be changed" (Ps. cii. 25, 26). Thus earth and the surrounding atmospheric heavens are not only to "perish," but they are also to be "*changed*," instead of being annihilated; and in their changed condition, after the great conflagration, they are styled the "new heavens and new earth." And there the righteous will dwell; for the seer of Patmos speaks, concerning the same new earth-home of the redeemed, as follows: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is *with men*, and He will *dwell with them*, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the *former* things are *passed away*. And He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things *new*" (Rev. xxi. 1—5). "New" heavens, "new" earth, "new" city, and "new" people, with a "new" King, constituting a "new" kingdom, and a "new" Paradise. This new earth-home is to be a

sinless, tearless, graveless, sorrowless, painless, and deathless realm.

Bnt when is this new earth-Paradise to be enjoyed by the saints? Peter introduces it after the deluge of fire; and John also gives it the same chronological place; for, just before mentioning the introduction of the new earth, he had carried us down to the resurrection, the judgment, and the punishment of the wicked, in the following language: "And I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away; and there was no place found for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and *hades* delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. xx. 11—15). The very next statement, after this description of the resurrection, the judgment, and the casting out of the wicked into the "lake of fire," is this:

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth." The subject has been unwisely obscured by beginning a new chapter in the middle of the subject. So we now discover that John brings to view the resurrection, the judgment, the final disposal of the wicked, or "perdition of ungodly men" in the future deluge of fire, and next in order he introduces the new earth-home of the saved.

But where are the raised saints to be while the wicked are being destroyed, and the earth is passing through its fiery baptism? Paul tells us that the saints are to be "caught up" when the resurrection takes place: "The dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to *meet* the Lord in the air" (1 Thess. iv. 16, 17). The prophet Isaiah also affirms: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs: and the earth shall cast out the dead. [What next?] Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the *indignation* be overpast. For behold, the Lord cometh out of His place to *punish* the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity" (Isa. xxvi. 19—21).

Thus the raised saints and the changed living saints are to be caught up to meet the Lord, and dwell in their celestial chambers till the "indignation" ends: for while the saints are thus housed away, the Lord is to "*punish* the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity;" and this "perdition of ungodly men" is to be in the "*fire*" unto which the earth is "reserved," or in the "lake of fire" which will be formed by the outgushing of the sea of fire now in the bowels of the earth, so frequently showing indisputable proof of its present smothered existence through those volcanoes that vomit out floods of fire and lava. But let it be remembered that the saints are to remain above only "till the indignation be overpast;" then the saints and the city shall "come down from God out of heaven;" and then "the tabernacle of God shall be with men," and then "there shall be no more death," in consideration of the fact that "the former things are passed away."

Then will God's plan in creating this globe be carried out, and the "very kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world" be given to the saints in its renovated condition, well adapted to their immortal state. Then will Paradise bloom on earth under the "second Adam," who has already stood His trial successfully, more gloriously than it bloomed while the



first Adam was on trial. Then the saints will dwell where once sin predominated, and evil-doers flourished "like the green bay tree;" but this will be after "the redemption of the purchased possession" after its redemption from the power of Satan and his emissaries, and also from the curse.

Jesus testifies (Matt. viii. 11, 12) concerning the future home of the saints as follows: "I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Here we learn that the previous possessors of the very kingdom which the saints are finally to sit down in are to be disinherited. In another discourse Christ remarks: "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of Man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather *out of His kingdom* ALL THINGS THAT OFFEND, and THEM WHICH DO INIQUITY; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." (Matt. xiii. 40—43).

Here we learn that the former occupants of the kingdom which the saints are hereafter to "shine

forth" in are to be dispossessed preparatory to giving it to the saints; and also learn that evil-doers once possessed it. But there is to be a mighty revolution in human affairs when Jesus comes. Sin will end, and righteousness fill the earth.

### WHEN ARE THE SAINTS TO BE REWARDED ?

THE testimony of inspired witnesses on this point is abundant and clear. Let us look at a little of the strong evidence bearing upon the question.

Said Jesus: "Behold, I come quickly: and My *reward* is with Me, to *give* every Man according as his work shall be" (Rev. xxii. 12). "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and *then He shall reward* every man according to his works" (Matt. xvi. 27). "Thou shalt be *recompensed at the resurrection* of the just" (Luke xiv. 14). "Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest *give reward* unto Thy servants the prophets, and to the saints" (Rev. xi. 18). Could testimony be plainer? Does it not connect the Christian's reward with the coming of Christ at the resurrection of the just? And does it not also place the reward of the prophets at the same point of time? In view of this fact, well

might Paul say : " When Christ who is our life shall *appear*, THEN shall ye also appear with Him in glory " (Col. iii. 4). And in consideration of this truth, Christ could say : " I will come again, and receive you unto myself " (John xiv. 3).

Thus the truth is clearly stated, that Christ is to receive the saints unto Himself, and that the saints are to enter glory at Christ's appearing. Why not enter glory before? Because they cannot enter glory *unjudged*, and the judgment is at the coming of Christ. Why does not Christ receive the saints unto Himself *before* He comes again? Because He does not *judge* them before His coming; and it would be a shocking idea to see *unjudged* men entering glory, and subsequently see them all turned out of glory, to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to be judged.

Peter informs the faithful that they should be rewarded with a " crown of glory," and also tells them when they should get it : " When the Chief Shepherd shall *appear*, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away " (1 Pet. v. 4). Paul speaks to the same effect : " Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day : and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing " (2 Tim. iv. 8). This crown is to be given by the

"righteous Judge;" and as Christ is not to "*judge*" the living and the dead till His "*appearing*," the crown cannot be given before the appearing of Christ.

Job expected to see his Redeemer "at the latter day" (Job xix. 25); David expected to be "satisfied" when he should "*awake*" from death's slumbers, in the Saviour's "likeness" (Ps. xvii. 15); Isaiah prayed that his Redeemer might "rend the heavens and come down" (Isa. lxiv. 1); Ezekiel's attention was fixed upon the time when God should "open the graves" of His people, and cause them "to come up out of their graves," and "enter the land of Israel" (Ezek. xxxvii. 12); Jeremiah's mind was directed to the time when the slaughtered innocents should "come again from the land of the enemy" (Jer. xxxi. 15); Daniel records a time to come when "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life," and deliverance come to "every one that shall be found written in the book" (Dan. xii. 1); Christ predicts a time when "they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world" to come "and the resurrection" shall be made "equal to the angels" (Luke xx. 36); John could affirm, "We know that when He shall *appear*, we shall be like Him" (1 John iii. 2); Paul tells us of ancient saints who "died in faith not having received the promises," affirming that "they

without us should *not* be made perfect" (Heb. xi. 13, 40) ; Peter exhorts us to "hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. i. 13) ; and the beloved disciple could exclaim : "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

In fact, all God's inspired saints have had their eyes fixed upon this glorious event as the time of redemption and reward.

### IS NOT THE SOUL OR SPIRIT TO BE REWARDED BEFORE THE BODY ?

CERTAINLY not, unless it is rewarded before the judgment, and that would be a curious notion—one reward for the soul before the judgment, and another reward for the body after the judgment ! This theology has no existence in the Book of God, and is utterly subversive of the doctrine of a future judgment-day, so clearly taught in the Bible. Whether the spirit is to be recognised as a distinct personality, or otherwise, Paul's desire was, "that the spirit may be saved IN THE DAY OF THE LORD JESUS" (1 Cor. v. 5) ; and when that day comes the judgment comes, and the spirit will then be connected with the body : so it will not be saved before the judgment, nor independent of the body, even if it were a deathless personality.

The Scriptures often speak of man's *spirit* and *soul*; and the inference has been drawn that the spirit is an organised *entity* within man, that can exist as a personality independent of the body, sometimes bearing the name of *spirit*, and sometimes called *soul*. But, upon examination, we find that these terms are never from the same original word, though used hundreds of times; hence, soul and spirit *are not the same*; and the same kind of proof that is used to show that the *spirit* is a *personality* within man would as clearly prove that the soul is a *personality* also; and that would prove *two entities* in one man, as really as one.

To prove that the spirit is an *entity* distinct from the body, we are often referred to 1 Thessalonians v. 23: "I pray God your *spirit* and *soul* and body be preserved blameless." This simply proves that man has a *spirit* and *soul* as well as a body; but if it proves the spirit an *entity* distinct from the body, it as clearly proves the soul an entity distinct from the spirit; agreeing with Hebrews iv. 12: "Piercing even to the dividing asunder of *soul* and *spirit*"—showing that they are *not one*, whether entities or not! We believe that man has both a spirit and a soul; but not in the sense of an organised *personality* within the person, or an invisible man within the man. We as really read of the "spirit of the beast" (Eccles. iii. 21) as "spirit

of the man ;” but are we therefore to conclude that every beast has an invisible organised beast within that escapes a beastly prison at death ! We read of the “ seven spirits of God ” (Rev. iii. 1) : but does this signify seven entities ? or so many elements ? Sometimes a class of beings are called spirits ; as God, angels, devils, and men ; *but whenever the SPIRIT OF A BEING* is spoken of, the term never signifies an *entity*, but an *element*, or an *influence*, residing in, or proceeding from, the being, as in the examples already cited — “ spirit of the beast ” — “ spirit of man ” — “ seven spirits of God.”

### SPIRIT OF MAN—WHAT IS IT ?

1. **M**AN possesses a *mental spirit—the mind*, or some of its passions, often being referred to under the term spirit : but mind, instead of being an organised personality, or entity, is simply the result of a well-arranged organism. The character and nature of the mind clearly proves this, for (1) the mind is feeble in infancy ; not a feeble spirit-entity : (2) mind matures with the body ; not a spirit-entity thus maturing : (3) mind is often affected by disease ; and a spirit-entity could not be thus affected : (4) mind frequently becomes insane ; and a spirit-entity

could not get deranged: (5) mind becomes childish in old age; a spirit-entity would not thus reach maturity and then decline: (6) mind, on a smaller scale, is developed in the beasts, for "the *ox* KNOWETH his owner, and the *ass* his master's crib" (Isa. i. 3); but this is not regarded as proof of a spirit-entity in the beast: (7) mind dies; "In that very day his *thoughts perish*" (Ps. cxlvi. 4).

2. Man possesses the "*spirit of life*," or "breath of life"—not the breath of *air*, but the "breath of LIFE;" an element that produces life alike in man and beast, and is manifested long prior to birth or before inhaling the breath of air—not an *entity*, but an *element*. This spirit will return to God who gave it; and "the body without [*this*] spirit is dead": with it we live, without it we die. The spirit that returns to God is simply the one that He "*gave*:" and the record says that was the "breath of LIFE," or "spirit of life" (Gen. ii. 7). We inhale and exhale the breath of *air* several hundred times each hour; but never does the "breath of LIFE," or "*spirit of life*," leave us till death; and after death a large amount of *air* still remains in the lungs; but life is extinct when the "spirit of life" leaves.

So, while the mental spirit, or mind of man, may die, the spirit of life cannot properly be said to die,



because it never lived, but simply *produced* life, or *caused* man and beast to live. An *element* cannot die or live. So while it is true that man has a spirit, it is never spoken of as *masculine*, or *feminine* ; but always in the *neuter* gender ; for it always signifies either the *mind*, which dies with the body, or “the spirit of life” —an element that leaves man at death.

If man possesses an immortal spirit-entity, what is its origin? How and when is it connected with the body? (1) Is it *transmitted*? Mortality cannot transmit immortality, as the stream cannot rise higher than the fountain: hence, it cannot be transmitted *unless the spirit propagates its species independent of the body*: and if it does, why not continue to do so after leaving its prison-house of clay, and thus eternally augment the number of spirit-entities in the spirit land? If we say this spirit-entity is *transmitted*, since mortality cannot transmit immortality, it must be transmitted by spirit-entities, involving the idea of *male* and *female* spirits; furthermore, if spirits propagate their species either in or out of the body, it involves them in *mortality*: for that which is transmitted is *divisible*, and that which is divisible is *destructible*, and hence not immortal. This is plain to all.

(2) If not transmitted, is it created at birth? If so, it makes God sanction all the whoredom in the land,

by imparting a spirit-entity to every illegitimate child. Is He continually labouring to help men to transgress His own commandments ?

(3) If this spirit-entity is neither transmitted, nor directly created at birth, is it a pre-existent entity ? If so, why do we not remember our former existence ? Could a spirit-entity forget its former existence by coming into a tabernacle of clay ? If so, why do not those spirits who enter spirit mediums forget the scenes in the spirit land, and even forget their former existence, and remain in the medium till the death of the body, instead of giving their history of the spirit-land and departing again ? But if memory is *not* destroyed by coming into the body, why do we not remember our former existence, if we ever had such an existence ?

We can easily find the origin of man's *spirit of life* (an element that causes man to live), and also the origin of his *mental spirit*, resulting from his organization ; but if man has a spirit-entity within, give us its origin. To deny that it has an origin is to deny its existence, unless it is a personal god, and then its memory could not be blotted out by entering a house of clay, nor would a god shut himself up in such a prison-house voluntarily, and could not be placed there compulsively.

The Bible asserts<sup>f</sup> that man has a spirit, but theologians *assume* in the absence of proof that that spirit is an *entity*, and that it [is also immortal. The Bible also asserts that the beast has a spirit—then why do they not claim that that spirit is also an entity, and likewise immortal? If one is an immortal entity, why not the other? The term spirit [Heb. *ruach*, Gr. *pneuma*] is applied to different classes of beings, good and bad; but when the spirit of a being is spoken of, it always represents either the mind, or some of its passions, or an element [in<sup>f</sup> a being, or an influence from a being.

### WHAT IS THE SOUL OF MAN?

**T**HIS term never signifies an entity within man; but it signifies *primarily* PERSON, as in the following instance: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man became* a living soul" (Gen. ii. 7), or person. In a secondary sense it signifies *life*, or the mind. The Hebrew term *nephesh*, from which soul is translated, is one hundred and twenty times rendered *life*, in the singular and plural; and the Greek term *psuche* is forty times translated life. The present life is temporal, but the Christian, through

Christ, secures endless life, which "life is hid with Christ in God;" for "this is the record, that God hath given to us *eternal life*, and **THIS LIFE** is in His Son" (1 John v. 11). So the saint has an endless life deposited in Christ: hence, Christ could say, "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul" [*psuche*], or *life*; this future life of the saint is out of the reach of the assassin; but the sinner's future life [soul, or *psuche*] will be destroyed with the body in hell, at the judgment-day (Matt x. 28). "My soul" sometimes signifies *myself*, and sometimes my mind; but we have already seen that mind is not an entity, but the result of organism, liable to changes, and a victim of death. If the soul were an immortal entity, it would involve the idea of reward at death, contrary to Scripture and to the faith of the early Christians and Reformers.

1. Saints are not rewarded *at death*, but at the judgment-day (read Luke xiv. 14; Rev. xi. 18; 1 Pet. v. 4; Col. iii. 3; 1 John iii. 2).

2. The soul is not *immortal*, but dies (Ps. lxxviii. 50; Ezek. xviii. 4; Ps. xxii. 29; Rev. xvi. 3; Ps. lxxxix. 48; xlix. 15).

3. The dead are *unconscious* till the resurrection. (Eccles. ix. 5; iii. 19; Ps. cxv. 17; vi. 5; cxlvi. 4).

4. This is not a new doctrine, but harmonises with

the views of primitive Christians, from which Christendom has apostatised. Says *Justin Martyr*, who was born fifty-six years after the cross, and martyred at the age of seventy-four : " If therefore you fall in with certain who are called Christians, who confess not this truth, but dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in that they say there is no resurrection of the dead, but that *immediately when they die their souls are received up into heaven*, avoid them, and esteem them not Christians."

Says Eusebius, in speaking of a class of Christians in the *third century*, " These asserted that the *human soul*, so long as the present state of the world exists, *perished at death*, and *died* with the body, but that it would be *raised again* with the body *at the time of the resurrection*" (p. 153).

Says Martin Luther, in his *Defence* (prop. 27) : " I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful, such as that he is emperor of the world, king of heaven, and God upon earth—that the SOUL IS IMMORTAL, with all these *monstrous* opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals." Again he says : " All *souls lie and sleep till doomsday*."

Duke George, in writing to Duke John, October 15th, 1521, says : " Some *deny the immortality of the*

soul. . . . All this comes of *Luther's teachings*." The Reformers were also charged with stating : "All which had been said about the *immortality of the soul* was *invented by Antichrist* for the purpose of making the *Pope's pot boil*."

In a work published in London, in 1772, entitled *An Historical View* (p. 348), it is recorded that Luther taught that souls "*lay in a profound sleep*, in which opinion he followed *many Fathers of the ancient Church*." It adds : "The doctrine was held by the *first Reformers*." Also : "Luther *died* in the faith."

Says Wm. Tyndal, who first translated the Scriptures into the English language, for which he was martyred : "If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be?" Again he says : "And ye, in putting them in *heaven, hell, and purgatory*, destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. . . . The *heathen philosophers* did put that the souls did *ever live*."

Says John Milton, author of *Paradise Lost*, in advocating the unconscious state of the dead : "It is evident that the saints and believers of old, the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, *without exception*, hold this doctrine."

Says Herodotus, over four hundred years before

Christ: "The *Egyptians* were the first who asserted the doctrine that the soul is immortal" (p. 144).

Protestants received the doctrine of the immortality of the soul from the *Papists*, and the Papists received it from the *Pagans*. This doctrine makes of none effect the resurrection, and makes the future judgment unimportant. How strange that a sentiment that was *Pagan in embryo*, and *Papal in childhood*, should be *Protestant in its manhood*! Without this heathen dogma, Catholicism could not exist, and Mahometanism would go into non-entity.

### IS THE SOUL OF THE PENITENT THIEF NOW IN PARADISE ?

IF so, it must have gone there unjudged, for judgment is located (1) "in the last day;" (2) at Christ's "appearing;" (3) when the "great white throne" and its occupant descends; and (4) when the seventh trumpet sounds—all of which events are yet future.

One thing is certain: inasmuch as God's arrangement does not clash with itself, either the judgment is wrongly located, or the import of Christ's promise has not been rightly understood. That the judgment is connected with Christ's "*appearing*" (2 Tim. iv. 1), is

a clear point, and it is certain that no man can receive his reward prior to the judgment, else there is no need of a judgment, as the judgment is for the express purpose of deciding the destiny of the human family, and to carry that decision into effect: and if this work precedes the judgment, it leaves nothing to be accomplished at the judgment, and makes the judgment a *worthless* arrangement; and also makes the statement untrue that the "*dead*" are then to be "*judged*," as well as the living. Besides this, we are expressly informed that the "*reward*" *comes at the judgment*, and not before it: "Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that Thou shouldest GIVE REWARD unto Thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear Thy name, small and great" (Rev. xi. 18).

The penitent thief is certainly one of the "*saints*" here mentioned, else Paradise would not have been promised to him at any point of time; and if he is one of the saints he is certainly included in the number who are to get their "*reward*" at the time the *dead are to be judged*; consequently it is not true that he is already enjoying his reward in Paradise; hence, the Saviour's promise to him has been misunderstood. These considerations lead us to seek for the true import of the Saviour's promise on the cross; and this



we will do by learning (1) what He did not mean, and (2) what He did mean.

### I.—WHAT HE DID NOT MEAN.

CHRIST did not mean to state that He and the dying penitent should jointly enter Paradise on the very day of the crucifixion, because :

1. This position would locate Christ's "SECOND" coming in the past, and as early as the time of His resurrection; whereas, Paul located His "second" coming in the *future* a long time after Christ's resurrection: "He *shall* appear the *second* time" (Heb. ix. 28). All agree that Christ came *once* and tabernacled in flesh over thirty years, and that this constituted His first coming—do they not? Yes. Now then, if at the crucifixion He left the flesh, and went back to heaven, and remained there three days, and then *came back again*, and tabernacled in flesh some forty days more, would not that make His *second* coming? Just as certainly as *one* and *one* make *two*. Let us count. He tabernacled in flesh over thirty years before leaving the world—did He not? Yes. Does not that make one coming? Yes. And you say He then left the world and went to heaven and remained there three days—do you not? Yes. You

also claim that He then *came again* to this world, and tabernacled in flesh a *second time*—do you not? Yes. Well, was not this as really a *coming of Christ* as in the first case? Yes. And do not one coming, and *another* coming, make *two* comings? Yes. And is not the next coming after the first the “second?” Yes. Then was not Paul mistaken many years afterward in telling us, “He *shall* appear the SECOND time?”

Rather let me believe that Paul was right, and that Christ’s statement has been misunderstood. Paul and Christ do not clash when rightly understood, and there can be but one “second” coming of Christ, and that is yet future; hence, Christ did not go to Paradise, and return again.

2. After Christ was raised from the dead, he told Mary in plain terms, “I am NOT YET *ascended*” (John xx. 17). Can we set aside this plain statement of the Master? No. Then we have no right to put a construction on His language on the cross which would make His own words clash. It is a positive fact from Christ’s own statement that He did not then “ascend,” although He had previously predicted His return to heaven in the following language:—“What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?” As late as the morning of His

resurrection, three days after His remark to the dying penitent, Jesus could truthfully affirm, "I am *not yet ascended*." Can we respect Christ's words? Then never so interpret His promise to the thief as to make His own statements conflict.

## II.—WHAT HE DID MEAN ?

CHRIST simply meant to give a plain reply to the consistent request of the dying penitent—nothing more nor less—and that request was, "Lord, remember me *when thou comest in Thy kingdom*." The thief had the impression that Christ contemplated coming again to establish a kingdom; and well he might have received this idea: for in the trial of Christ, He was accused of seeking to make Himself a king, and in mockery of His claim to the kingship He was crowned with a "crown of thorns;" so Pilate interrogated Jesus about this matter: "Art thou the king of the Jews?" (John xviii. 33). Jesus remarked: "My kingdom is not of this world [that is, this world of sin and death]: if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My kingdom not from hence" (v. 36); that is, not from henceforth, or from this time forward. Pilate

clearly saw by this reply that Jesus contemplated the establishment of a kingdom at some future time; so he again puts the question to Jesus in this form:—"Art thou a king, then?" (v. 37). Jesus replies, "Thou sayest that I am a king. *To this end was I born*, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth" (v. 37), or this truth.

Here Christ confesses to Pilate (1) that His kingdom was not to be established in this world of death and sin; that His kingdom was not to commence then, and extend from that time forward: and (2) another evangelist gives this item in Christ's confession: "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man *sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven.*" The thief having thus learned that Christ claimed to have been born to be a king, and that He denied that His kingdom was from thenceforth, or from that time forward, and claimed that they should finally see Him "coming in the clouds of heaven," enthroned on "THE RIGHT HAND OF POWER," or in kingly majesty, knew Jesus' teaching concerning His kingdom; and the only thing that remained to be decided in his mind was whether Christ was the true Messiah, or an impostor: and as the sun refuses to shine, and darkness covers the land, he is convinced.

that more than an ordinary man is dying, and concludes that Jesus must be the true Messiah, and if so, He will come in the clouds of heaven, as He had promised, to set up His kingdom at the end of this age of sin; and with this impression on his mind, he recognises Jesus as "Lord," and offers to Him his heartfelt petition: "Lord, remember me when thou comest in Thy kingdom."

The immediate reply of Jesus was, "*Amen lego soi semeron met emou ese en to Paradeiso.*" Let it be observed, that the first word in the Saviour's reply is "*amen*," which signifies "so let it be." The word *amen* that we use so frequently is simply a Greek term incorporated into our language, and we well know its meaning. The translators have rendered it by the term "verily" in this text, which fails to give the full meaning of the Saviour's reply. Following an ancient punctuation, a fair rendering of the text would read as follows, making the request and reply harmonious, and also agreeing with the truth that reward comes after the judgment:

"Lord, remember me when Thou comest in Thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, So LET IT BE—I tell thee to-day, Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise."

When?

Just when he requested to be remembered: for

Paradise is as really to bloom in the kingdom of the second Adam, as it did in the kingdom of the first Adam; for when earth shall be renewed, and the river of life shall flow, "on either side of the river" will be "the tree of life which is in the midst of the *Paradise* of God" (Rev. xxii. 2, ii. 7), so Paradise will bloom on earth again when Christ sets up His kingdom, and the penitent thief will then be remembered, and that, too, at the point of time he prayed to be remembered, and thenceforward will be with Christ in Paradise.

What was the request? "Lord, remember me when Thou comest in Thy kingdom." What was the reply? "AMEN"—or, "So LET IT BE:" that is, Let it be according to thy request—and then to make the matter doubly positive, Jesus adds: "I say unto thee to-day [despite surrounding circumstances, everything to human appearance looking as though I should never have a kingdom, yet] thou shalt be with Me in Paradise," which shall bloom in My kingdom.

The modern exposition destroys the harmony between the request and the reply, and clashes with the Bible fact that reward must be given after the judgment-day comes.

## LAZARUS AND THE RICH MAN.

IS the soul of Lazarus now in glory, and the soul of the rich man in the hell of punishment? Certainly not, if heaven and hell are included in the reward due to saint and sinner, for reward is the *result* of *judgment*, and must therefore come *after* the judgment, and the judgment is not in the past.

Inspiration having decided the question that Christ shall "judge the quick and the dead at His appearing," and also that when the "*time of the dead that they shall be judged*" shall arrive, then comes the time that God "should give REWARD unto His servants the prophets, and to the saints" (Rev. xi. 18), there is no escape from the conclusions (1) that our *reward* is after the arrival of the judgment, instead of being prior to that point; and (2) that the judgment is connected with Christ's "appearing:" hence, it follows that there will be no judgment until Christ shall appear, and no reward till the judgment arrives.

In the face of this God-given truth, an effort is made to deduce an opposite theory, from the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, recorded in Luke xvi., as though God's Word would teach one doctrine in one place, and a conflicting one in another. But we wish

to show, in a few words, that God's Word is in harmony with itself on this subject, and the unfounded inferences, and unwarranted assumptions of men, have produced all the confusion and lack of harmony on this question. Let us look at it:

1. We are told that the rich man went to the hell of punishment at death. I deny it: but the rich man went to *hades* (here incorrectly rendered hell), which *never* means a hell of punishment, but is simply the depository of the dead, good and bad, till the judgment-day: and John brings to view the same fact, and shows us that they are to be judged after coming out of *hades* (here again wrongly rendered hell): "And death and *hades* DELIVERED UP THE DEAD THAT WERE IN THEM: and they were *judged* every man according to their works" (Rev. xx. 13). So *hades* is finally to deliver up the *dead* to be "JUDGED," which harmonises with Peter's claim that God will "RESERVE THE UNJUST UNTO THE DAY OF JUDGMENT TO BE PUNISHED" (2 Peter ii. 9). Thus it is evident that though they are in *hades* till the judgment, they are not being punished: and this case of the rich man, which we shall show to be a parable, is the only one in the entire Bible adduced to conflict with this fact; and when shown to be a *parable*, it will no longer be viewed as an exception, as a *parable never means*



*what it says*, but is always one thing to represent another.

Paul informs us that the saints are to come from *hades* at the sound of the last trump, shouting: "O death, where is thy sting? O *hades* where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. xv. 55.) Thus the saints will come from *hades* at the resurrection; but surely they will not come from a world of torment, or a hell of punishment, yet they will come from the very realm that the rich man is said to have gone to—*hades*. When the hell of punishment for the wicked is mentioned, another term is employed—*gehenna*; and the wicked are never said to go to that hell till the judgment-day.

2. Lazarus was said to be carried, *not to heaven*, but to "Abraham's bosom." Now, if this is a literal case, and not a parable, then the rich man simply went to *hades*, instead of going to the future hell of punishment, and Lazarus merely went to "Abraham's bosom," instead of going to heaven. But, as the position is assumed, without proof, and contrary to facts, that *hades* MEANS *hell*, and "Abraham's bosom" MEANS *heaven*, and that with this *amendment* to the subject, it is a literality, and not a parable: we will look at it in this light for a moment. The rich man and Abraham see each other, and *talk* together: so if the one is in

heaven and the other is in hell, it follows that *hell* must be very near heaven—within sight and hearing—located either just *under* heaven, or on a level with heaven, one side or the other, or just above it. With either location, it would involve the idea of going *up to hell*, instead of *down* to hell; and, if it were just *below* heaven, every saint would have to fly through the *fire* to get from earth to heaven, or sail round the outer edges; so that in leaving earth for either hell or heaven, we must take the same road a part of the distance, even if we do come to forks in the road, for the sake of getting around the fire just *under* heaven, within speaking distance—say within a stone's throw—the incessant shrieks of anguish from numberless millions within hearing of heaven—every shriek, every cry, every groan is within hearing, and sinners within sight!

If it is not under heaven, but just on one side of it, then hell is as high *up* as heaven. Who ever dreamed of going *up* to hell?

It can't be located above heaven, as that would make hell the highest "up," and give sinners a road through heaven up to hell. But if this is a literal case, there is no escape from the shocking conclusion that heaven and hell are really within sight and hearing of each other—hell being either on one side of heaven,

or immediately under it, with its ever-rising fumes of brimstone—a sweet posy for those theologians who must claim that this is a *literal* case, and a *literal hell*, in opposition to all facts, and contrary to the great fact that reward comes after the judgment.

Who will accept it as a literal case *now*, with all of these results? Not one. Then it certainly is a parable, and parables always bring up one thing to represent another; it may present something real, or suppose a case that never had an existence, as in Jotham's parable: "The *trees* went forth on a time to anoint a *king*," &c. Now, let those who urge this parable as an objection against our views *prove* what it represents, or it avails them nothing; not *assume* a meaning for it, but *prove* what it represents, or hold their peace.

Let no one lose sight of the fact that a parable never means what it says, but is simply one thing to represent another. Wheat never meant wheat, in a parable, but was used to represent something else; tares never meant tares in a parable, but were used to represent something else: so, in this parable, a rich man does not mean a rich man, a Lazarus does not mean a Lazarus, a hell does not mean a hell, a gulf does not mean a gulf, but these are all used to *represent* something else.

The Saviour, in giving His parables, always made use of figures that the people were familiar with. In giving a parable to the Jews, He would not employ figures that they could not understand, as such figures would fail to illustrate the fact with which He wished to impress their minds. The Pharisees, to whom this parable was addressed, had embraced an unscriptural idea concerning *hades* (here rendered hell), regarding it as a "*subterranean region*" in the bowels of the earth, and believing in "*rewards and punishments under the earth*," of a temporary nature—one part of this "*SUBTERRANEAN*" *hades* was for the righteous, called "*Abraham's bosom*," and angels escorted the good to this place; while the other department contained a lake of fire, and the wicked were driven near this lake, and suffered from the heat of the flames: between these two departments was a "*gulf*" which was impassable, yet the two regions were within sight and hearing of each other.

This is a condensed statement of Josephus' account of their view of *hades*. And this is evidently the ground-work of the Saviour's parable—that is, to illustrate a certain truth, He employed these figures, with which they were familiar—"hades," "*Abraham's bosom*," the "*gulf*," and the "*flames*"—not for the purpose of sanctioning their theory, for He elsewhere

cautions us both against the doctrine of the *Pharisees* and of the *Sadducees*, the one class having gone to one extreme, and the other class to the other extreme.

While in captivity, a part of the Jews imbibed the speculative notions of the heathen concerning life after death, and coined up this view of *hades*, as the locality of that future existence; but another portion of the Jews refused to imbibe these heathen views: so, after their return from captivity, the class who imbibed these heathen notions, and mixed them up with the truth of the Bible, were called *Pharisees*, having a *corrupted* faith; but the other class not only repudiated this element of heathenism (life in death), and insisted that man is *totally dead*, but in their over-anxiety to get as far as possible from this heathen notion (life in death), they blindly rushed to the opposite extreme, and claimed that man was not only totally dead, but also *eternally* dead—no resurrection.

Now the Saviour neither endorses the *corrupted* views of the *Pharisees*, nor the extreme notion of the *Sadducees*; but specially cautions us against the doctrine of both classes (Matt. xvi. 6).

So Christ, in selecting figures from the theology of the *Pharisees*, out of which to frame a parable for their special benefit, must not be understood as endorsing their views: because (1) to endorse their

theory, would be to endorse what He had cautioned us against; and (2) it would conflict with the popular claim that Abraham's bosom represents heaven above, where Christ is, instead of a *subterraneous* region in the bowels of the earth. It would be as fatal to modern theology to insist that Christ endorsed the Pharisees' view of "*hades*" and "*Abraham's bosom*," as to our view: so we are all agreed that Christ did *not endorse* their view, for if He did, that would blot out the popular application of such statements as these—"Depart, and be with Christ"—"Absent from the body, and present with the Lord"—"To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise" in "the third heaven"—for Christ is not in the bowels of the earth, nor is the "third heaven" there.

Yet it remains a fact, that although Christ did not endorse the Pharisees' view that Abraham's bosom is in the bowels of the earth, and that the departed dead, both good and bad, dwell in such an underground world, He *did* select figures from this received view to illustrate a certain truth—He did speak of a rich man as going to the PHARISEES' *hades*, He did speak of a beggar as going to the other department, called Abraham's bosom; He did speak of the Pharisees' impassable gulf; He did speak of the torment of the rich man, and the comfort of the beggar

—all to simply *illustrate* a certain truth; not to adopt their theology, alike averse to Scripture, and modern theology.

What truth did Jesus wish to illustrate by this parable? This we can find out by reading the connection, and learning what called forth the statement. Jesus had been addressing the *Pharisees*—a prominent branch of the nominal Church of God, of whom God had said, “I am married unto you”—and in this address He charges them with the crime of breaking their marriage covenant, and being wedded to *mammon*, and shows them that the marriage contract of the law is about to expire, and a new arrangement to take its place; in other words, that this Jewish-law Church to whom the Lord was married was about to “become *dead* to the law,” and the Gospel contract about to take place, which would give place to “*every* man that presseth into it”—that is, to Gentiles as well as Jews.

In chap. xvi. 13, He begins by saying: “Ye cannot serve God and mammon. And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things: and they derided Him. And He said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men [mammon] is abomination in the sight of God.

The law and prophets were [preached] until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it [or presseth *for* it]. And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail. Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." This language immediately precedes the story or parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Christ makes the following points:

1. If they served mammon they broke their covenant relation to God: but their *covetousness* led them to serve mammon.

2. They had thus committed "*adultery*" in leaving God, and being wedded to mammon.

3. The *Law* had been preached till John, then a new ministry began; and "every man" could then be permitted to press into the kingdom, Gentiles as well as Jews; and the old Law economy *began to die then*, and fully expired at the cross: the *Old Covenant Church* *virtually* died then, and the *New Covenant Church* then arose; "ye also are become dead to the law, by *the body of Christ*; that ye should be MARRIED TO ANOTHER, *even to him who is raised from the dead*" (Rom. vii. 4).



Then, to illustrate the death of the Old Covenant Church, and the reception of the New Covenant Church, He speaks the following parable: "There was a certain rich man [representing the Old Covenant Church] which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day [possessed of wealth and enjoyment]. And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores [representing the spiritual poverty and helplessness of the Gentile race]." The [foregoing represents the condition of the two parties prior to the *change* in their condition, which is here represented by death, and a removal to a different region. "And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom: and the rich man also died, and was buried, and in *hades* he lifted up his eyes, being in torments."

The following facts are set forth:

1. A *change* takes place in the history of the Gentile race, represented by death; though once destitute of spiritual food and raiment, and covered with moral pollution, the Gospel angels conduct them to the faith of Abraham, and by faith they become his children.

2. A *change* likewise overtakes the rich Jewish Church, represented by death, and it is plunged into a state of temporal chastisement or torment. The great gulf of *unbelief* will allow no alleviation or remedy to be administered. By hearing Moses and the prophets, which proclaim Christ, they might have warded off this torment, from different branches of the fleshly family of Israel, in different localities, but the different branches of this family, in other regions, were as unbelieving as the main branch of Jerusalem, which first felt the fire of temporal judgment: even a resurrection of dead ones failed to convince them.

Here are the main features of the parable, in a condensed form. Thus the Old Church, once exalted, apostatised, and is now being chastised, and has been for 1,800 years. The New Covenant Church receives into the Abrahamic faith the once polluted Gentile, and *rejects* the Jewish claim of blood relationship, which says, "We have Abraham to our father." The gulf of unbelief is impassable. Those of every polluted tribe of Gentiles are comforted *in Christ*; while the mere blood relative of Abraham, who rejects Jesus as the true Messiah, is tormented. The five brethren, or different branches of the Jewish family, fared no better than the main branch of this fraternity (the rich man) at Jerusalem.

## WHEN ARE THE WICKED TO BE PUNISHED?

PUNISHMENT of some nature awaits the finally impenitent, to be inflicted upon them at some point of time.

When does this punishment commence? We answer, *Not at death*, but at the judgment, for the following reasons:

1. "Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof *in the day of judgment*" (Matt. xii. 36). God will never execute a criminal till he has given an account; and as the sinner is not to give an account at death, but at the judgment-day, it follows that the unholy will not be punished before the great day of account.

2. "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to *reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished*" (2 Peter ii. 9). Thus the sinner is not now receiving his punishment, but is being *reserved* "unto the day of judgment to be punished" in hell: hence, if there is a burning hell now in existence, sinners would not enter it prior to the judgment. But while the Scriptures describe a hell for the ungodly, a "lake of fire," they do not teach its present existence.

3. "And they that have done evil [shall come forth] unto the *resurrection of damnation*" (John v. 29). The "damnation of hell," of which the Saviour speaks, is here located on the other side of the resurrection; hence, the resurrection must *precede* the existence of *hell*.

4. If there were a burning hell *now in existence* we might reasonably inquire why the demons are not confined there. If human sinners are now writhing in a hell of fire, why is not the captain of sinners with his crew of demons kept there also? But he "goeth about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour," and is "walking to and fro in the earth"—not in hell. Devils were frequently cast out of human beings by the Saviour: thus they are not in hell, as they doubtless would be if it were now in existence.

5. If the doctrine of the *present existence* of hell were true, some sinners would suffer centuries longer than others who commit a greater amount of crime: for instance, the man of *few sins*, who died a thousand years ago, must suffer a thousand years longer than the man of *many sins* who dies to-day.

6. If the wicked were now being punished in hell, a vast amount of speculation might exist among them concerning their destiny at the judgment. Hopes

might be entertained that they would be released then, seeing that they had been sent thither before being tried.

We will now examine every text of Scripture in which the term *hell* is found. By so doing, we shall learn that the present existence of a burning hell is not taught in the Bible, but that it is to exist at the judgment. Before commencing this examination, it is proper to state that the word *hell* is translated from four original terms, namely: *sheol*, *hades*, *tartarus*, and *gehenna*. The first three terms here mentioned never mean a burning hell, while *gehenna* does.

*Sheol* is translated "hell" thirty-one times, as follows:

1. "Shall burn unto the lowest hell" (Deut. xxxii. 22).

If *sheol*, here translated hell, signifies a world of punishment, the above text would prove a plurality of such hells. *Sheol* is translated *grave* just as often as it is *hell*. It is not the fiery hell of damnation; for *saints* go to *sheol* at death as really as sinners do. Job prayed, "Oh! that Thou would hide me in *sheol*" (Job xiv. 13). Did he pray to be hid in a burning hell of fire? Jacob said, "I will go down into *sheol* unto my son mourning" (Gen. xxxvii. 35). Did he think of going to a hell of fire? David said, "God

will *redeem* my soul from the power of *sheol*" (Psalm xlix. 15). Did he expect to go to a hell of fire, and then be *redeemed* therefrom? God, in speaking through Hosea concerning the resurrection of the saints, remarks, "I will ransom them from the power of *sheol*" (Hos. xiii. 14). Thus all of the saints will come from *sheol* at the resurrection. *Sheol* is not the receptacle of *ghosts*, but of *dead men*—*corporeal* men. Said Jacob, "Then shall ye bring down my *gray hairs* with sorrow to *sheol*" (Gen. xlii. 38). That part of man which wears "gray hairs" goes to *sheol*. Do *ghosts* wear gray hairs?

2. "The sorrows of hell compassed me about" (2 Sam. xxii. 6).
3. "Deeper than hell" (Job xi. 8).

*Sheol* is thirty-one times translated *grave*: it always signifies the realm or state of the dead.

4. "Wicked shall be turned into hell" (Ps. ix. 17).

The state of the dead who experience the second death is here spoken of—the future state of the wicked.

5. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell" (Ps. xvi. 10).

Spoken of Christ. Christ's soul went to *sheol*, here translated hell; hence, *sheol* is not the hell of punishment.

6. "Sorrows of hell compassed me about" (Ps. xviii. 5).
7. "Let them go down quick into hell" (Ps. lv. 15).
8. "Delivered my soul from the lowest hell" (Ps. lxxxvi. 13).
9. "Pains of hell gat hold upon me" (Ps. cxvi. 3).
10. "If I make my bed in hell" (Ps. cxxxix. 8).
11. "Her steps take hold on hell" (Prov. v. 5).
12. "Is the way to hell" (Prov. vii. 27).
13. "Are in the depths of hell" (Prov. ix. 18).
14. "Hell and destruction are before the Lord" (Prov. xv. 11).
15. "That he may depart from hell beneath" (Prov. xv. 24).
16. "Deliver his soul from hell" (Prov. xxiii. 14).
17. "Hell and destruction are never full" (Prov. xxvii. 20).
18. "Hell hath enlarged herself" (Isa. v. 14).
19. "Hell from beneath is moved for thee" (Isa. xiv. 9).
20. "Thou shalt be brought down to hell" (Isa. xiv. 15).
21. "With hell we are at agreement" (Isa. xxviii. 15).
22. "Your agreement with hell shall not stand" (Isa. xxviii. 18).
23. "Didst debase thyself, even unto hell" (Isa. lvii. 9).
24. "Hell is naked before him" (Job xxvi. 6).
25. "When I cast him down to hell" (Ezek. xxxi. 16).
26. "They also went down into hell with him unto them that be slain" (Ezek. xxxi. 17).
27. "Shall speak to him out of the midst of hell" (Ezek. xxxii. 21).

Nothing to be found in the above texts to prove that *sheol* is a lake of fire.

28. "Are gone down to hell with their *weapons of war*" (Ezek. xxxii. 27).

Do "weapons of war" ever go to the hell of punishment?

29. "Though they dig into hell" (Amos ix. 2).
30. "Out of the belly of hell cried I" (Jon. ii. 2).
31. "Enlargeth his desire as hell" (Hab. ii. 5).

We can find no proof in the foregoing texts, that *sheol* when translated *hell* signifies a burning realm. Every text in the Old Testament containing the term *hell* has been quoted, but none of them speak of a burning world. *Sheol* never signifies *hell*, and should never have been thus translated.

*Hades* is translated *hell* ten times, as follows :—

1. "Shalt be brought down to hell" (Matt. xi. 23).
2. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi. 18).
3. "Shalt be thrust down to hell" (Luke x. 15).
4. "In hell he lift up his eyes" (Luke xvi. 23).
5. "Wilt not leave my soul in hell" (Acts ii. 27).
6. "His soul was not left in hell" (Acts. ii. 31).
7. "The keys of hell and of death" (Rev. i. 18).
8. "And hell followed" (Rev. vi. 8).
9. "Death and hell delivered up the dead" (Rev. xx. 13).
10. "Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. xx. 14).

The reader will perceive that Christ is twice spoken of as not being left in *hades*, here translated *hell*, and that *hades* is finally to be cast into the "lake of fire;" hence, *hades* is not the lake of fire, or *hell*, in which the wicked will be punished. Aside from the case of the rich man, there is no intimation that *hades* is a burning realm; and that exception occurs in a parable: consequently, in that instance *hades* is used figuratively. Should any one insist that this is a



literal historical narration, let him not shrink from the revolting conclusion that hell is *within sight* and within *speaking distance* of heaven, and that the shrieks and groans of the damned would drown the hallelujahs of the saved ; and that the parents in heaven must be continually in sight and hearing of their miserable offspring who are writhing in keen anguish, and shrieking in hopeless agony. Take the consequences, or admit it a parable.

If it is literal history, instead of a parable, let it be remembered that *hades* is the only hell here mentioned, and that within sight and speaking distance of the saved. The opinion is prevalent that hell is away down somewhere, a great way below the earth, while heaven is located as far above the earth. This locates hell and heaven twice as far apart as we now are from either place. Yet these same theologians refer us to the case of the rich man and Lazarus to prove the disembodied existence of ghost-men in hell and heaven. If disembodied spirit-men are here brought to view as having gone to hell and heaven, and if hell and heaven are really such an immense distance apart, what keen eyesight that rich spirit-man must have had to have seen a spirit-Lazarus millions of miles away ; and what refined hearing, also, in these two localities, to have understood the conversation of each

other millions of miles apart! or what powerful spirit-lungs to speak in tones a million times louder than the deafening roar of the largest cannon, in order to be heard that vast distance. Wonder if it would be pleasant standing near them, even in heaven, when they speak? Wonder if it would not make "confusion worse confounded" to have them all speak at once? And more than all, if they speak so loud as to be heard from hell to heaven, I wonder why we who live midway between hell and heaven never hear the terrific blast from spirit-lungs!

Is it good logic to assert that a cannon report can be heard ten miles, and deny that it can be heard half way? Our hearing is good enough to recognise the buzz of the feeblest insect, and who shall say that we are too deaf to hear a voice that can be plainly heard millions of miles beyond us? Will the excuse be made that material ears are not capable of hearing the voices of immaterial lungs? But it will not be contended that *spirit-men* are composed of more refined spirit-substance than the *angels* are, especially as it is so generally claimed that the departed good *become angels* at death, and the departed bad become devils; and it is an authenticated fact that material ears have often heard the voice of angels; then why may we not hear the voice of disembodied

spirit-men, if they are really speaking in such trumpet tones?

Those that insist that a disembodied Lazarus, and a disembodied rich man, and a disembodied Abraham are intended, and really conversed together, are solemnly obligated to present a genuine solution of this mystery—one predicated, not upon supposition or conjecture, but upon invulnerable and discernible facts. Let us know how it is, that while the cries of the damned are hourly wafted by us, and conveyed far enough beyond us to salute the ears of the dwellers in heaven, we fail to hear the first sound. But should this position be changed, so as to make hell nearer heaven than to the earth, then they should henceforth talk about going *up* to hell instead of going *down* to hell. Would it not be better to seek the truth, and and learn that *hades*, instead of *gehenna*, is the hell here mentioned—not a place of punishment for dead men?

Paul reasoned concerning a final judgment, not concerning a judgment now in session, but a "*judgment to come*." Judgment includes both the passing and execution of a sentence, either for or against a person. Hence, a "*judgment to come*" implies the arrival of a time when a *sentence is to be passed* upon saint and sinner; and a sentence cannot be executed before

being passed; and as the sentence in favour of the saint is his final reward in glory, and the sentence against the sinner is his reward in hell, it follows that the reward of both saint and sinner is subsequent to the judgment. Then, as our reward is the result of the decision made at the judgment, and, consequently, cannot precede the judgment, what is the chronological location of this "judgment to come?" Christ says: "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him [when?] *in the last day*" (John xii. 48). Consequently, there is no reward for saint or sinner prior to "the last day;" therefore all this speculation about a home of felicity for the saint, or about a home of fire, or state of irrevocable oblivion, for the sinner, *prior* to "the last day," is subversive of the Divine plan. Let God's plan stand. Let the judgment come *first*, and let the reward come as the result of the judgment, and let the judgment come at the right time, namely: "*in the last day*," and all this talk about *present* reward in heaven, hell, or oblivion then would cease.

Modern theology is subversive of the Scriptural doctrine of a judgment-day; as it represents men as going to heaven or hell before being judged, involving the idea of a future rally from hell and heaven to "stand before the judgment-seat of Christ"—which would be like first hanging a man, and afterward trying his

case! Neither the reward of the righteous, nor the damnation of the sinner can be realised before the judgment. Jesus never told us that we must give account *at death*, but "they shall give account *in the day of judgment*" (Matt. xii. 36).

*Tartarus* is translated "hell" once, as follows :

"For God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment" (2 Pet. ii. 4).

*Tartarus*, which is here translated hell, is not spoken of as the place where sinners are to be punished, but merely as the state of the fallen angels : nor is it the place of *their punishment* ; for they are to be "reserved unto judgment" to receive their doom : furthermore, they are among the children of men, and were frequently cast out of human beings. *Tartarus* occurs nowhere else in the Scriptures.

### WHERE WILL THE WICKED BE PUNISHED ?

**W**ILL the wicked emigrate to some remote realm to receive their punishment, or will the foretold hell of the impenitent exist on the earth at the great burning day? *Answer.*—"The heavens and the *earth* which are now, by the same word are

kept in store, reserved unto *fire* against the *day of judgment* and *perdition of ungodly men*" (2 Pet. iii. 7; Prov. xi. 31; Matt. xiii. 40—42).

*Gehenna* clearly brings to view the future hell of the ungodly, but as clearly disproves its *present existence*. The wicked are to be destroyed in *gehenna*, "both soul and *body*" (Matt. x. 28): and certainly the body does not go to a burning hell at death: therefore the existence of *gehenna* [hell] is on the other side of the "RESURRECTION OF DAMNATION." Prior to *that* resurrection there is no damnation or hell for the ungodly: for God will "RESERVE THE UNJUST UNTO THE DAY OF JUDGMENT TO BE PUNISHED." Jesus informs us that the whole body will be cast into *gehenna* (Matt v. 30), of course at the judgment-day!

*Gehenna* is translated "hell" twelve times, as follows:

1. "Shall be in danger of hell fire" (Matt. v. 22).

*Gehenna* brings to view a burning hell, but we shall soon learn that it is not to exist before the judgment.

2. "Thy whole body should be cast into hell" (Matt. v. 29).

As the body does not go to a burning hell *at death*, it follows that hell [*gehenna*] is not in existence.

3. "Whole body should be cast into hell" (Matt. v. 30).

Seeing the *body* does not go into hell-fire at death, it cannot go there before the judgment-day, when "they that have done evil [shall come forth] unto the resurrection of damnation;" hence the hell of punishment will commence at the judgment.

4. "Destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. x. 28).

None will claim that "*both soul and body*" go to hell *at death*.

5. "Rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire" (Matt. xviii. 9).

6. "More the child of hell than yourselves" (Matt. xxiii. 15).

7. "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" (Matt. xxiii. 33).

8. "Having two hands to go into hell" (Mark ix. 43).

9. "Having two feet to be cast into hell" (Mark ix. 45).

10. "Having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire" (Mark ix. 47).

11. "Hath power to cast into hell" (Luke xii. 5).

12. "Set on fire of hell" (James iii. 6).<sup>2</sup>

When the impenitent are cast into hell-fire, they are to go there with *hands, feet, eyes, and body*; and as none go into the fires of *gehenna* at death corporeally, it must be admitted by all that the existence of hell commences at the judgment-day: therefore, the *present existence* of a burning hell is not taught in the Bible. We have quoted every text in the Bible which speaks of *hell*.

By reading Proverbs xi. 31, we are taught that the recompense of the sinner is to be rendered "*in the*

*earth.*" Again: the sublime prophet testifies (Isa. xxiv. 21), "It shall come to pass in that day the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth [where?] *upon the earth.*" Allusion is here made to the doom of the wicked at the judgment, and not to temporal punishment, as we learn from the three preceding verses: "The windows from on high are open, and the foundations of the earth do *shake*. The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean *dissolved*, the earth is moved exceedingly. The earth shall *reel to and fro* like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage: and the transgression thereof shall be heavy upon it; and it shall fall, and not rise again. And it shall come to pass *in that day*, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth *upon the earth.*" Thus "the *earth*" is to be the place where Jehovah will punish the wicked; or, in other words, *hell* will be located in the earth, at the final conflagration. Peter testifies that "the heavens and earth. . . . are reserved unto *fire*, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (2 Pet. iii. 7). The "perdition [*apoleia*—destruction] of ungodly men" is here connected with the future deluge of fire. The lake of fire, or hell of fire, in which the ungodly will



meet their awful doom, is to exist upon the earth, amid the fires of the last day.

For successive generations the *literality*, as well as the eternity, of hell-fire has been tenaciously maintained by so-called Orthodox theologians. But recently invulnerable facts are compelling many of them to recede from their old position. Fire is perpetuated only by feeding upon fuel of some kind, and when the fuel is consumed the fire is extinct. Hell-fire must consume something if literal; and if it is eternally to burn, it must be eternally consuming some kind of fuel: hence God must either be eternally putting fuel in hell, to keep the fire up, or the wicked must constitute the fuel upon which the fire feeds; and *literal fire* would make rather strange work in feeding upon invisible intangible ghosts. But as literal fire has an invariable tendency to consume that upon which it preys, though sometimes at a slow rate, if the wicked are the fuel of hell, they must ultimately be consumed.

These obvious absurdities are now compelling many to deny the *literality* of hell-fire, and inducing them to claim that *conscience* is the tormenting element of the damned, represented by the figure of fire. Well, this is like "jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire:" for sin *benumbs* the human conscience, so that the Scriptures speak of some as "*having their consciences*

*seared*" by continuance in sin. Thus if conscience is the only fire that scorches the damned, it follows that those of many crimes (who have "their consciences *seared*") will suffer the *least*, while those of *few* sins will suffer the *most*. To escape the keen torments of *that* hell we have only to *sin much*! Rather let me believe that the fire of hell is *literal*, and that it will literally "*burn up*" the sinful rubbish of God's universe.

"Behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall *burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them *neither root nor branch*" (Mal. iv. 1; Ps. xxxvii. 10; 2 Thess. i. 9; Obad. xvi; Rev. xx. 9).

There is a *future* hell, or lake of fire, for the wicked (Rev. xxi. 8). The whole man is guilty, and the whole man must be punished at the same period—not an abstract part at a time! Modern theology casts reflections upon God's past dealings with men, while it claims that the soul is the only intelligent part of man, and the body a mere organ through which the soul operates. For instance, in the Mosaic dispensation, the man who picked up sticks on the Sabbath must be stoned to death. Here (according to modern theology) the *wicked soul* stood behind the

curtain, and made a tool of the innocent body, with which to commit the sin. Then God commands the *innocent body* to be stoned to death, and lets the wicked soul escape the penalty. The truth is, the entire man sins, and the entire man reaps the penalty.

### HOW ARE THE WICKED TO BE PUNISHED ?

PAUL affirms, "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. vi. 23). What death? Not *temporal* death, for the sinless infant and the holy saint just as really die that death as the impenitent. Not *spiritual* death, a death in "trespasses and sin," for that is the very thing that renders man deserving of punishment, instead of being the punishment itself. The penalty death is not visited upon the sinner *in* this life, nor *at* the close of this life. The execution of the penalty cannot precede the judgment. Said Christ, "The word that I have spoken, the same *shall judge him* [not in this life, nor at death, but] *in the last day*" (John xii. 48). Paul presents the fact that "it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment" (Heb. ix. 27). The penalty death *cannot precede the judgment*: and the judgment is "after" death, and "in the last day;" therefore the penalty

death must be visited upon the sinner "in the last day:" thus agreeing with Peter's teaching, that God will "reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment *to be punished*" (2 Pet. ii. 9); consequently, the penalty death is not inflicted upon the sinner either in this life, nor in temporal death, but beyond it, when "they that have done evil [shall come forth] to the resurrection of damnation" (John v. 29). The penalty death, the death to be inflicted "in the last day," is denominated the "*second death*," in contradistinction from a preceding death. The "second death," must be the second infliction of a death of the same order of itself, otherwise it would be the first death of this kind, and the first death of that kind—no second about it. The Bible mentions two kinds of death—literal death and spiritual death, a death in "trespasses and sin"—and theologians mention a third kind of death: a "death that never dies;" by which they mean eternal torment. Hence, the "*second death*" must be the *second infliction* of one of these kinds of death. Let us examine the three kinds, beginning with the last one mentioned.

1. If the penalty death signifies eternal misery, then, inasmuch as the penalty death is styled the "second death," it follows that it is the *second* eternal misery! Then *when* and *where* was the first eternal

misery inflicted? For a "*second*" presupposes a first. This would prove *two editions* of eternal misery; and, furthermore, as the second edition must succeed the first, if the first is endless in duration, it leaves no room for the second; if the first is not endless, then the second will not be. Here the endless misery system can neither back out nor go forward. Two editions of endless misery, the second not beginning till the first is over, and yet nobody can find the first, and if it could be found, it would last so long that it would never allow the second to begin!

2. If the penalty death signifies a spiritual death, a death in "trespasses and sin," then, inasmuch as the penalty death is styled the *second* death, there must be an *end* of the *first* death of this kind before there can be a *second* infliction of it: and when the first death in "trespasses and sin" is *ended*, the man is free from sin, and is no longer a sinner; hence, will not be punished. God will not punish a man that is free from "trespasses and sin." He will not make them dead in "trespasses and sin" a second time, or *make them sinners again*, after they are liberated from a death in "trespasses and sin."

3. If the penalty is *literal* death, then inasmuch as the penalty, death, is styled the "*second* death," it must be the second infliction of literal death upon the

sinner. Saint and sinner alike die the first death, and are alike liberated from it: but over the saint "the second death hath no power," while the sinner must die the "second death." All are made to live again at the judgment-day, to be judged; but saints will die no more, while sinners, then judged obnoxious to the wrath of God, will die the second death; and thenceforward "shall never see life," but abide beneath the irrevocable stroke of the penalty death.

The inspired apostle assures us that the impenitent "shall be punished with everlasting *destruction*" (2 Thess. i. 9). Destruction never signifies *preservation*, but just the reverse. This destruction with which the wicked are to be punished is everlasting; or, this *punishment*, which is destruction, is everlasting. Not everlasting in process of infliction, for then it would not be destruction; but everlasting in its consequences.

*Death*, and not life, is threatened to the sinner as his punishment; hence, we read, "The wages of sin is *death*"; and, "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth *death*." Not the first death, for both the saint and the sinless infant are victims of that death; but "on such the *second death* hath no power," while the ungodly are its victims. The punishment is death, and the death is everlasting. The wicked will as really be consumed by everlasting fire as the Sodomites were

by eternal fire (Jude 7). Its *results* will be everlasting.

From the foregoing investigation, we have learned (1) that the *commencement* of hell is at the judgment-day, (2) that its *location* is to be the earth, at the time of the flood of fire; and (3) that *destruction* is the nature of the punishment then and there to be inflicted.

*Death* is not *life*, but the opposite—the extinction of life. The “second death,” if there is any power in language, implies a repetition of the first (otherwise it would be the first of one kind, and the first of another kind—no “second” about it), and as the first is a cessation of life, the second must likewise be. The wages of sin, which is *death*, will terminate the existence of the wicked—they have no promise of eternal life—but are destined to be *destroyed* “both soul and body in hell” at the judgment-day!

“But the wicked shall *perish*, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall CONSUME; *into smoke shall they consume away*” (Ps. xxxvii. 20).

“Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel, both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and He shall *destroy the sinners thereof out of it*” (Isa. xiii. 9).

“For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen; as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy REWARD shall return upon thine own head. For as ye have drunk upon My holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and they shall be *as though they had not been*” (Obad. 15, 16).

“Behold, all souls are Mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is Mine: *the soul that sinneth it shall die*” (Ezek. xviii. 4).

“But the fearful, and the unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the *second death*” (Rev. xxi. 8).

We will now examine the prominent objections which are raised by our antagonists. The following quotation is raised as an objection to this view “These shall go away into *everlasting punishment*” (Matt. xxv. 46). This does not, in the slightest manner, militate against our position, for we firmly believe the language of the text, and if it will gratify our opponents, we are willing to have the language made still stronger, by substituting the phrase **ETERNAL** punishment. But we claim the right to inquire into



the *nature* of this punishment. What are they to be punished with? Modern theologians answer, With endless misery! But this is an assumption! Where do we read it in the Bible? Nowhere! But the inquiry again rises, What is to be their punishment? The answer is obvious—"The wages of sin." Paul will give us some information in relation to what constitutes the wages of sin. "The wages of sin is DEATH"—not eternal life in misery, but death—the extinction of life! Therefore, their punishment is everlasting or eternal death.

The inquiry again arises, What are the wicked to be punished with? Let Paul answer. He informs us that they "*shall be PUNISHED with everlasting DESTRUCTION* from the presence of the Lord," &c. (2 Thess. i. 9). Hence their punishment is not to be endless torment, or eternal life in misery, but quite the reverse, "*everlasting destruction.*"

It will avail nothing to conjecture that the text means that they shall be destroyed from the *spiritual* presence of the Lord, as many have never been in possession of His spiritual presence!

The "everlasting punishment" to which the wicked are doomed, is "*everlasting destruction,*" or "*death!*" This punishment will be everlasting in its effects, consequences, and results, but not in its *infliction!* We

read of "*eternal judgment*" (Heb. vi. 2). We do not suppose, however, that the judgment is to remain eternally in session; but it will be a judgment, the results of which will be eternal. We also read of "*eternal redemption*" and "*eternal salvation*." Will God be eternally *redeeming* and *saving* man? No. It implies a redemption and a salvation, the effects and results of which will be eternal, final! So in relation to "*everlasting punishment*;" everlasting not in its infliction, but in its effects. It will be final—never to be recalled! This is the nature of "*everlasting punishment*," as plainly set forth in the Bible. The penalty of God's law is DEATH, which is the sinner's punishment, his inevitable doom!

We now pass to notice another supposed strong objection. "It is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." (Mark ix. 43, 44). We view this as strong proof in favour of the *destruction* of the wicked; and the Jews, to whom this language was addressed, who understood the *origin* of the word *gehenna*, which is here translated *hell*, could not possibly have understood the Saviour as teaching anything but *utter destruction* of the wicked. "*Gehenna*" (the original word from

which "hell" is here translated), is derived from "ge"—valley, and "Hinnom"—the name of the man who once owned the valley. Say *The Polymicrian Greek Lexicon* to the New Testament: "*Gehenna, properly the valley of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem; once celebrated for the horrid worship of Moloch, and afterwards polluted with every species of filth, as well as the carcasses of animals and dead bodies of malefactors; to consume which, in order to avert the pestilence which such a mass of corruption would occasion, constant fires were kept burning.*"

Says Parkhurst's *Greek and English Lexicon* to the the New Testament: "This valley of Hinnom lay near Jerusalem, and had been the place of those abominable sacrifices in which the idolatrous Jews burned their children alive to Moloch, Baal, or the Sun. . . . Our Lord seems to allude to the worms which continually preyed on the dead carcasses which were cast into the valley of Hinnom [*gehenna*], and to the perpetual fire there kept to consume them."

Now who can fail to see at a single glance, that the wicked who are to be cast into the antitypical *gehenna* [hell] are to be utterly consumed? The Saviour could not have used a term which would have more effectually conveyed the idea of entire destruction than *gehenna*, from which *hell* is translated in this instance.

All that was cast into "gehenna," south of Jerusalem, was *utterly consumed* by the worm, or by the fire which preyed thereupon—so also will the wicked who are to be cast into hell [*gehenna*] be utterly destroyed "both soul and body," be burned up "root and branch" at the judgment-day! As sure as the fire is not quenched, and as sure as the worm does not die, so sure will that upon which they prey be totally consumed! To illustrate. We gaze upon a barn while on fire, and readily conclude that, unless the fire is quenched, the barn will be burned up. We walk out into the corn-field, and discover that a worm is at work upon a blade of corn, and we at once conclude that unless the worm dies, the corn will be destroyed.

Now, as the agent which God has chosen to effect the destruction of the sinner (represented by the undying worm and the unquenchable fire) is not to be stayed, the sinner must perish! Should the fire be quenched, and the worm die, the sinner might escape death.

But, says the objector, the undying worm is the gnawing conscience, or the soul of the sinner. This is an assumption totally out of harmony with the facts in the case. I might just as consistently assert that the *fire* is the soul. Let us go back to old

"*gehenna*" and inquire what the "*fire*" and the "*worm*" then were. The worm was not a part of that which was cast into the valley, but an agent which devoured that which was cast therein. So in the language of Christ, the worm that "dieth not" represents the chosen agent of Jehovah in inflicting destruction upon the impenitent when cast into hell [*gehenna*]. "And they shall go forth, and look upon the CARCASSES of the men that have transgressed against me: for THEIR worm shall not die, neither shall *their* fire be quenched" (Isa. lxvi. 24). Who will maintain that those "carcasses" had consciences, or souls! Yet "*their worm* [the worm of the carcasses] dieth not." The worm here spoken of is not a part of the "carcasses," but something that *devours* them.

It is maintained by some that "unquenchable fire" implies that the fire must perpetually burn. Let us examine the Scriptures on this point. In speaking of the sacrifices upon the Jewish altars, it is said: "The fire shall EVER be burning upon the altar; it shall *never go out*" (Lev. vi. 13). Is that fire now burning? Certainly not! Yet this language would as forcibly prove that this fire was to be perpetual, as in the case of the wicked. The evident design of the language was to give the assurance that the fire was

destined to burn until the sacrifice was utterly consumed. So in the case of the sinner's impending doom. Again, the prophet Jeremiah, in predicting Jerusalem's destruction, declares: "Then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall *not be quenched*" (Jer. xvii. 27).

Are the "gates" and "palaces" of Jerusalem now burning? No! Why then so tenaciously contend that the doctrine of perpetually burning the wicked is taught, when similar expressions constitute your only proof?

Great stress is laid upon such expressions as these: "The smoke of their torment shall ascend up for ever"—"Shall be tormented day and night for ever," &c. But upon an examination of the Scriptures, we ascertain that the phrase "for ever" is frequently used with a limited signification; therefore, this fact will militate with force against the idea of a perpetual existence of the wicked in liquid fire. The phrase "*for ever*" is almost invariably limited to the duration of the object to which it is applied; therefore, when applied to that which possesses immortality, it runs parallel with its existence; but when applied to mortal objects, it terminates with their expiration; and "they that sow to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap

corruption," and "utterly perish in their own corruption" (be raised with mortal bodies to the "resurrection of damnation"); therefore, the Bible does not proffer eternal existence to lost sinners, as "for ever" in their case is limited.

We will present one instance, out of a variety, in which "*for ever*" will not bear the popular construction of *no cessation*. In speaking of bondmen, which the children of Israel were permitted to purchase, it is said, "They shall be your bondmen FOR EVER" (Lev. xxv. 46). Now let us see if "for ever" imports *no cessation* in this case. Suppose a godly man to have existed in the Mosaic dispensation, who purchased an ungodly wretch for his bondman. The time finally arrives when the godly master must die, and (according to modern theology) at death his soul soars to heaven. But his bondman is to be his "bondman *for ever*," and if "for ever" imports no cessation, of course the wicked bondman must also go to heaven! Or, if the wicked bondman should die *first*, his soul (according to the theology of the day) must go directly down to *hell*. And as the master is to have him for a "bondman *for ever*" (if for ever implies *no cessation*), the master himself must also go to hell. Thus, in order to gratify the modern construction put upon the term "for ever," we must either crowd

the righteous into hell, or admit the wicked into heaven!

Again: suppose the master and the bondman were both pious men; then (according to modern theology) the souls of both would fly up to heaven at death: and thus, according to the construction put upon the term *for ever*, an endless state of slavery would be introduced into heaven!

The force of the strongest arguments which are arrayed against our position is suspended upon the assumed import of the term *for ever*. How exceedingly absurd it is to maintain that the sinner will live endlessly, while destitute of immortality, and whereas God's Word declares, "The soul that sinneth, *it shall die*"—"The wages of sin is *death*."

In order to prove the *present* existence of a hell, it is contended that the Sodomites are now "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" (Jude 7). But the text does not convey this idea. They *then* "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" are *now* "set forth for an example." Who were the victims of this "eternal fire?" *Answer*.—Not disembodied souls, but those who gave "themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh"—not an abstract part of them—and none will maintain that disembodied souls went "after strange flesh," and therefore cannot maintain



from this text that such souls are now burning, and all know that those Sodomites were long ago burned up ! “But the *same day* that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, *and destroyed them all*” (Luke xvii. 29). This is the only fire spoken of by Jude. Dr. Macknight’s translation reads : “Are set forth an example, *having undergone* the punishment of an eternal fire.” This does not furnish even a shade of proof in favour of the present existence of a burning hell, somewhere out of sight, and beyond the knowledge of mortals ! The fire which God rained upon Sodom is styled “eternal fire,” in consequence of its effects ; but that fire is not now burning, for it has long since turned “the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah *into ashes*”—yet this language is as strongly indicative of *perpetual* burning as is ever applied to the sinner !

The modern theory of endless torture has a direct tendency to bring the character of God into serious disrepute, and has driven its thousands upon thousands into Universalism and Infidelity ! We are told that if our view is correct, the sinner would be more likely to continue in sin than he would if threatened with endless torture. Not so ; for it sets the character of God in a justifiable light. If the sinner will not accept the offers of salvation, God will punish him for his

sins, and he shall cease to live—and God will have an universe cleansed from sin and sinners! We have no right to threaten the sinner with more than God has threatened him. *Threatening* is not the great inducement to repentance. Says the apostle: "We love Him because He first loved us;" and again: "The goodness of God leadeth men to repentance." The promise of *eternal life* is held out as the great incentive to faith and obedience. Life is desirable. Even our present short life is valued highly, though it is mixed with sorrow and woe! We are willing to sacrifice anything to have life prolonged; and though we suffer pain, and endure trials, yet we prize *life* above everything else, even in sorrow's cup. Now if a *short life* is so desirable, what must "*eternal life*" be? If a life mingled with tears, sighs, sickness, sorrow, pain, and mourning is desirable, what estimate should be put upon a life perpetuated throughout the endless ages of eternity, amid scenes of surpassing splendour and unfading delight in a blooming Paradise, where "there shall be no more pain, nor sickness, neither sorrow nor crying?"

"Eternal life," yes, *ETERNAL life*—how sweet the sound! Is any sacrifice of pleasure, or enjoyment of the fading scenes of earth, too great to make, in order that we may obtain *eternal life*? It is the theme

of the Gospel! It is that which eclipses the brightest scenes, and surpasses the greatest pleasures that earth can afford. Sinner, seek life through the Son of God: "He that hath not the Son of God hath not life" (1 John v. 12). "In the *world to come* eternal life" (Mark x. 30).

### WHEN WILL THE SAINTS OBTAIN ETERNAL LIFE, OR IMMORTALITY?

THE following queries often arise:

1. "Is not immortality the same as eternal life?" *Answer.*—Strictly speaking, immortality, instead of being eternal life, is the *basis* of eternal life, and eternal life is the *result* of immortality; so that those who are made immortal will be sure of eternal life, and those who have eternal life have it because they are immortal: immortality is the *cause*, and eternal life the *result*.

2. "Are not Christians said to possess eternal life? and are they not therefore immortal?" *Answer.*—The Christian has eternal life in prospect, but not in actual possession: "This is the record, that God hath given to us *eternal life*, AND THIS LIFE IS IN HIS SON" (1 John v. 11). "This is the *promise which He has*

*promised us, EVEN ETERNAL LIFE*" (1 John ii. 25); "in the *world to come* eternal life" (Mark x. 30); "this mortal shall put on immortality" "at the last trump."

3. "Are we to suppose that Christendom has so long been astray on the question of immortality?"

*Answer.*—We are to suppose that what we now find clearly stated in the Bible has been there for many generations, and if true when first put into the Bible, *it is true still*, whether men have believed or disbelieved it. Men were "turned unto fables" by departing from truth. The question is, What has *God said* about this matter? not, What have men formerly believed? "Let God be true, and every man a liar." Man is never said to possess immortality till the resurrection, and then the righteous only. The term immortality is used only in the *five* following instances in the Bible: "Who [Christ] hath abolished death, and hath brought life and *immortality* to light through the Gospel" (2 Tim. i. 10). Christ, by the resurrection, "abolished death" in His own case, and exhibited *immortality* in His own Person: this is proclaimed "through the Gospel." "He is the first-fruits."

"God will render . . . to them, who by patient continuance in well-doing *seek* for glory and honour and *immortality*, eternal life" (Rom. ii. 7). Here man is represented as being in *pursuit* of immortality;

for, as yet, Christ "*only* hath immortality" (1 Tim. vi. 16); that is, from among the sons of men : for God is styled "*immortal*" (1 Tim. i. 17). But if Christ is the only one yet made immortal by the immortal Jehovah, and man is in quest of immortality by the obedience of faith, when will he obtain it? Paul answers : "At the last trump . . . . this mortal must put on *immortality*. So when this corruptible shall have put on . . . . *immortality*, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor. xv. 52—54).

The term immortality is found in no other passage in the Bible ; hence, this is the Bible doctrine on that subject—Christ obtained immortality by a resurrection, and His saints are to obtain it in the same manner.

THE END.



~~MAY 31 1985~~





